



80 300R

CANADIAN OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
COLLECTION

DE PUBLICATIONS OFFICIELLES
CANADIENNES

NATIONAL LIBRARY/BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE
CANADA

APPENDIX
TO THE
FORTY-SIXTH VOLUME
OF THE
JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
DOMINION OF CANADA
SESSION 1910-11



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST
EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
1912

LIST OF APPENDICES 1910-11

- No. 1.—Report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, as follows: The evidence of Dr. William Saunders, and of Mr. J. H. Grisdale of the Dominion Experimental Farms; of Mr. James E. Johnson, Simcoe, Ont., on fruit culture; of Mr. A. G. Gilbert, Poultry Manager of the Central Experimental Farm, and of Mr. J. A. Ruddick, Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner. *Printed for distribution in pamphlet form only. No final report of Committee at time of Dissolution.*
- No. 2.—Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, as follows: The evidence of Messrs. C. H. Parmelee, J. O. Patenaude, G. S. Hutchinson, R. Boudreau, R. E. Cook, P. A. Gay, and of Thomas Mulvey, in connection with certain payments for supplies purchased by the Printing Bureau from the Canada Law Book Co., Ltd., and from other firms. *Evidence printed in day-to-day form for use of Committee; not submitted with report to the House.*
- No. 2a.—The evidence of Messrs. L. M. Lymburner, H. N. Lymburner, and L. M. Lymburner (recalled), in connection with certain payments to Lymburner Limited, Montreal. *Evidence reported for printing for use of Committee; afterwards, submitted for the information of the House.*
- No. 2b.—The evidence of Messrs. E. D. LaFleur, G. Stead, C. E. Davies, Hon. Wm. Pugsley, W. Valiquet, T. N. Doody, F. Loggie, G. Stead (recalled), Hon. Wm. Pugsley (recalled), in connection with certain payments to A. & R. Loggie, for dredging at Dalhousie, Bathurst, Caraquet, and Loggieville. *Evidence reported for printing for use of Committee; afterwards, submitted for the information of the House.*
- No. 3.—Report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections on charges preferred by P. E. Blondin, M.P., against A. Lanctot, M.P., for the Electoral District of Richelieu. *Printed in day-to-day form, and submitted with report for the information of the House.*
- No. 4.—Report of the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries, as follows: The evidence of Messrs. J. Fraser Gregory, George McKean, Hugh McKay, W. B. Snowball, R. Ritchie and Thomas Robb, in connection with the consideration of the Water-Carriage of Goods Act, and Clause 10, Chapter 61, 9-10 Edward VII., of said Act. *Printed in day-to-day form, and submitted with report for the information of the House.*

REPORT
OF THE
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE
ON
AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

THIRD SESSION, ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1910-11

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT



OTTAWA

PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST
EXCELLENT MAJESTY

1911

[App. No. 1—1911]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
THE COMMITTEE.....	VII
INTERIM REPORTS.....	139

EVIDENCE.

PART I—AGRICULTURE.

Dr. WM. SAUNDERS, C.M.G., Director Dominion Experimental Farms..	1-13
--	------

THE UPBUILDING OF AGRICULTURE IN CANADA.

Some of the crops of the year.....	2
Yields of principal cereal crops in each Province for years 1909 and 1910..	3
Results obtained on trial plots of grain on Experimental Farms..	4
Central Experimental Farm (Ottawa).....	4
Charlottetown, P.E.I.....	5
Brandon, Man.....	5
Indian Head, Sask.....	6
Lethbridge, Alberta (Non-irrigated).....	6
Lethbridge, Alberta (Irrigated).....	6
Lacombe, Alberta.....	7
Agassiz, B.C.....	7
Fort Vermilion, Alberta.....	7
Yields of principal grain crops in United States for years 1909 and 1910..	8
Free distribution of seed grain.....	9
Dry-farming.....	10
Our heritage in agricultural lands.....	11
New Experimental Stations.....	13

Mr. J. H. GRISDALE, Dominion Agriculturist, Central Experimental Farm..	15-41
---	-------

ROTATIONS AND SOIL CULTIVATION.

Canadian crops in 1910.....	15
Central Experimental Farm crops, 1910.....	16
Canadian crop possibilities.....	16
Influences affecting crop production.....	17
Soils and drainage.....	17
Treatment of soils.....	18
Drainage.....	18
Weather or climatic conditions.....	19
Soil moisture control.....	19
Suit the line of farming to the location.....	20
The rotation followed.....	20
What to look for in a rotation.....	20

	PAGE.
The two-year rotation.	21
The three-year rotation.	21
The four-year rotation.	21
Five-year rotations.	22
Character and quantity of fertilizer.	22
What is meant by fertilizer.	22
Barnyard manure the farmer's fertilizer.	23
Humus.	23
Applying barnyard manure.	23
The quality of the manure.	23
Other methods of increasing humus.	24
Cultural operations.	24
The implement to use.	25
The broadcast seeder not recommended.	26
The roller.	28
The soil packer.	28
Spacing the rows.	28
Quantity of seed to sow.	28
Suitability and thoroughness of cultural operations.	34
The quality and variety of seed.	34
Harvesting methods.	34
Cost of cultural operations.	35
Wise economy of time and labour.	36
Cost of producing the crop unit.	38

Mr. A. G. GILBERT, Poultry Manager, Central Experimental Farm.	43-70
--	-------

RAVAGES OF BLACKHEAD IN TURKEYS.

Description of the disease.	43
The extended ravages of Blackhead in Canada.	44
What we have done in Ottawa.	44
Symptoms of the disease.	46
Preventative measures.	47
Recommended remedies.	49

THE PRODUCTION OF EGGS IN WINTER.

The increasing demand for strictly new laid eggs.	55
The farmers' great opportunity to supply the strictly new laid eggs.	61
Formation of egg circles.	63
Best methods to adopt in procuring eggs in winter.	63
Proper rations for use during winter.	64
Best food and treatment of young chickens.	67
Moulting of the hens in summer.	67

Mr. JAMES E. JOHNSON, Simcoe, Ont.	71-94
--	-------

CO-OPERATIVE FRUIT CULTURE.

Introductory remarks.	71
Formation and growth of Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association.	75
The packing of apples by the Association.	79
Prices obtained by the Association for its apples.	84

APPENDIX No. 1

	PAGE.
Steps necessary in the formation of a fruit growers' association.	88
Why co-operation is not more successful among farmers.	90
Sprays for apple trees.	92
The care of a young apple orchard.	93

Mr. J. A. RUDDICK, Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner.	95-110
---	--------

COLD STORAGE FOR APPLES AND OTHER FRUIT.

Apples for International exhibitions.	95
The cold storage of apples.	96
Boxes vs. Barrels in cold storage.	96
The importance of quick cooling.	97
Cold storage will not prevent all waste.	97
Ventilation of barrels.	98
Apples grown in 1909.	99
Importance of prompt storage.	100
Apples for Festival of Empire.	100
Extending the season for choice varieties.	100
Repacking not necessary.	101
Apples should be wrapped in paper.	101
McIntosh Red and Fameuse.	101
Apples damaged in the orchards after packing.	102
Cold storage for grapes.	102
Trial shipments of peaches.	104
Price guaranteed to growers.	105
Improved transportation.	106
Private shipments of peaches.	106
The outlook for Canadian peaches in Great Britain.	107
South African peaches.	107

PART II—IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. W. D. SCOTT, Superintendent of Immigration.	113-136
---	---------

THE COMMITTEE.

(M. S. SCHELL, Esq., *Chairman.*)

Messieurs:

Ailard,	Herron,	Owen,
Allen,	Hodgins,	Paquet,
Armstrong,	Hughes,	Parent,
Arthurs,	Hunt,	Pickup,
Beauparlant,	Jameson,	Proulx,
Béland,	Kidd,	Rankin,
Best,	King,	Richards,
Black,	Lafortune,	Robb,
Blain,	Lake,	Roche,
Blondin,	Lalor,	Ross (<i>Rimouski</i>),
Boyer,	Lancôt	Ross (<i>Middlesex</i>),
Bradbury,	(<i>Laprairie-Napierville</i>),	Russell,
Broder,	LeBlanc,	Rutan,
Brown,	Lennox,	Savoie,
Burrell,	Lewis,	Schaffner,
Campbell,	Lortie,	Schell,
Carrier,	Lovell,	Sealey,
Carvell,	Low,	Seguin,
Cash,	Macdonald,	Sexsmith,
Champagne,	MacNutt,	Sharpe (<i>Lisgar</i>),
Chew,	McAllister,	Sharpe (<i>Ontario</i>),
Chisholm (<i>Antigonish</i>),	McCall,	Sinclair,
Chisholm (<i>Huron</i>),	McCarthy,	Smith (<i>Middlesex</i>),
Chisholm (<i>Inverness</i>),	McCoig,	Smith (<i>Nanaimo</i>),
Clare,	McColl,	Smith (<i>Stormont</i>),
Clark (<i>Red Deer</i>),	McIntyre,	Sperry,
Conmee,	McLean (<i>Huron</i>),	Sproule,
Currie (<i>Prince Edward</i>),	McMillan,	Stanfield,
Currie (<i>Simcoe</i>),	Madden,	Staples,
Delisle,	Magrath,	Stewart,
Devlin,	Major,	Talbot,
Donnelly,	Marcile (<i>Bagot</i>),	Thornton,
Douglas,	Marshall,	Tobin,
Ecrément,	Martin	Todd,
Edwards,	(<i>Montreal, St. Mary's</i>),	Tolmie,
Elson,	Martin (<i>Wellington</i>),	Turcotte (<i>Nicolet</i>),
Ethier,	Mayrand,	Turgeon,
Fisher,	Meighen,	Turriff,
Fraser,	Meigs,	Verville,
Gauvreau,	Middlebro,	Wallace,
Gilbert,	Miller,	White (<i>Renfrew</i>),
Girard,	Molloy,	Wilson (<i>Laval</i>),
Gordon (<i>Kent</i>),	Monk,	Wilson (<i>Lennox and</i>
Gordon (<i>Nipissing</i>),	Nantel,	<i>Addington</i>),
Harris,	Neely,	Wilcox,
Henderson,	Oliver,	Wright.

THE UPBUILDING OF AGRICULTURE IN CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

COMMITTEE ROOM No. 34.

WEDNESDAY, December 14, 1910.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met this day at 11 o'clock, A.M., the Chairman, Mr. M. S. Schell, presiding.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, the hour has come for us to commence our session. We are pleased to have with us again this morning, Dr. Wm. Saunders, Director of Dominion Experimental Farms. He has frequently been before us in connection with this work, and his addresses have invariably been not only full of information, but of great value to the agriculturists of this country. The best monument, I think, which will ever be erected to his name will be the work he has been the means of carrying along so successfully in connection with the Experimental Farms of Canada. I suppose there has never been a time in the history of the Dominion, or of the world at large, when there has been so much interest taken in the advance of agriculture—in the most scientific methods and in everything that pertains to the largest possible development of our agricultural resources—as there is to-day. Whether it is our bank managers, the heads of the great railroad corporations, the business men of the country, or the farmers themselves, I do not think there has ever been as much interest taken in scientific agriculture and everything that makes for progress and development in that particular branch of our national life, and the work that Dr. Saunders and other men of similar character have performed, has conduced largely to this increased inquiry and interest in the advance of agriculture. We are pleased to have him with us again this morning, and I am sure he will receive a most attentive hearing.

DR. WM. SAUNDERS.—Again I have the opportunity of appearing before the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. This, I believe, is my twenty-fourth annual appearance before this committee, having enjoyed the privilege of being called before you each year for the past twenty-four years. For many years past my story has been one of agricultural progress and of the rapid upbuilding of that great agricultural industry of which we are all so proud and concerning which Canada is now so widely and so favourably known.

It has always seemed to me a marvel that this country has been able to maintain so high a reputation and make such wonderful progress and such substantial growth, when we consider the quantity of poor material which immigration has brought to our doors within the past years. While we have had many thousands of good, practical and well-informed farmers cast in their lot with us, men who are devoting their knowledge and skill to the work of making this a good agricultural country, we have, at the same time, had many more, largely from Europe, who have brought with them little or no knowledge of agriculture and who have almost everything to learn. The reputation of this country as an attractive and promising home for the industrious farmer must necessarily be built up from the average results

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

obtained from this mixture of men of inferior intelligence with superior men. The substantial crops which have been harvested on these lands in spite of the drawback of much inferior farming, have been such as to fully establish the claims made of their high fertility and great crop producing power. Most of the settlers on these fertile lands are striving to learn and are every year becoming more competent as practical farmers, and are very thankful for any kindly advice they can get from those who have received better training.

Still, in recording the average grain crops in any district, the lighter yields got by many of the poorer farmers must, for a considerable period yet to come, reduce the average to a much lower figure than it would otherwise stand at if the farmers in such localities were all possessed of a good knowledge of their business.

SOME OF THE CROPS OF THE YEAR.

In the final estimate of crops given in the Census and Statistics Monthly, the wheat crop of Canada is given as follows:—Spring wheat, 133,379,600 bushels; fall wheat, 16,610,000 bushels, a total of 149,989,600 bushels, with an average yield for the whole Dominion of 16.14 bushels per acre. Of oats, the total yield was 323,449,000 bushels, with an average yield per acre of 32.79 bushels; and of barley, 45,147,600 bushels, with an average yield of 24.62 bushels per acre, making a total for wheat, oats and barley of 518,586,200 bushels. These final reports show a decrease as compared with the final reports of last year. In spring wheat there is a falling off of 17,269,400 bushels; in the total crop of oats of 30,017,000 bushels, and in that of barley 10,250,400 bushels.

These reductions in crop have occurred mainly in the western provinces, and have been chiefly due to the great drought which prevailed over a large area in the Canadian Northwest during the greater part of the growing season of 1910.

The eastern provinces had exceptionally fine weather, and the crops have been bountiful and the quality of the products excellent. These provinces show gains in two of the crops to which I have referred, namely, wheat and oats. The increase in wheat in the eastern provinces is placed at 1,836,600 bushels; the increase in oats, 28,669,000 bushels, while there is a decrease in the crop of barley of 269,400 bushels.

By Mr. Best:

Q. What method have you of finding out the average of the different crops?

A. Our information is obtained through the Bureau of Statistics, a branch of the Department of Agriculture, which has very extensive machinery for compiling these results. Information is got from every quarter of the Dominion, and it is compiled in their office.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Is that estimate made by the different provinces?

A. The figures I am giving you are entirely from the Bureau of Statistics of the Dominion Department of Agriculture.

In other crops, especially important in the east, the returns have been most gratifying. The hay crop will total about 15,291,000 tons, the market value of which, computed at the local prices this year, will be \$147,287,000. Much of this hay, which is of first quality, will be required for the building up of the stock industry. This excellent fodder material will be supplemented in the provinces east of Manitoba by a large crop of turnips and of other field roots of an estimated value of \$20,618,000, also by a yield of fodder corn of 2,551,000 tons, valued at \$11,957,000. The total value of the hay, field roots and fodder corn is \$179,862,000, being about \$17,000,000 in advance of last

APPENDIX No. 1

year. Such substantial returns to the farmers of Eastern Canada will provide means for a healthy growth in all branches of agriculture and must prove a stimulus to agricultural progress.

While all the eastern provinces have shared in the prosperity which a good harvest has brought about, Ontario, with the large area of land under crop, always occupies a position of prominence. While the increase in the total crop of wheat in Ontario in 1910 amounts to 1,543,000 bushels, the yield per acre of spring wheat rose from 17.45 bushels in 1909 to 20.19 in 1910; winter wheat from 24.24 to 25.24 bushels per acre, while the increase in the oat crop in 1910 was 19,725,000 bushels, with an average yield per acre of 39.40 bushels, as compared with 34.75 bushels in 1909. There was a slight decrease in the total crop of barley of 225,000 bushels, due to a smaller acreage being sown; the average yield per acre, 29.75 bushels, being slightly greater than that of the previous year, 29.04. Of corn for husking, which is grown mainly in Essex, Lambton, Kent and Elgin, and which covered an area in 1910 of 299,040 acres, there was produced 17,853,000 bushels. The yield per acre increased from 56.91 to 59.7 bushels. This compares very well with the corn area in the United States, which gave a yield of 27.4 bushels per acre. The increase in the production of hay in Ontario is perhaps the most important item we have yet enumerated, the increase amounting to 1,976,000 tons with an estimated value of \$8,197,000.

YIELDS OF PRINCIPAL CEREAL CROPS IN EACH PROVINCE FOR YEARS 1909 AND 1910.

In the following table the particulars of the yields of the principal cereal crops in each province are given for 1909 and 1910:—

	Yield per acre, 1909.	Total Yield, 1909.	Yield per acre, 1910.	Total Yield, 1910.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
<i>Prince Edward Island—</i>				
Spring wheat.....	20.00	522,000	20.52	615,600
Oats.....	33.70	6,201,000	36.48	6,778,000
Barley.....	27.61	169,000	28.00	159,600
<i>Nova Scotia—</i>				
Spring wheat.....	19.80	404,000	22.85	480,000
Oats.....	31.56	4,358,000	39.52	5,723,000
Barley.....	24.77	221,000	30.33	264,000
<i>New Brunswick—</i>				
Spring wheat.....	20.15	395,000	19.03	371,000
Oats.....	27.87	5,775,000	29.69	6,351,000
Barley.....	29.26	94,000	35.29	73,000
<i>Quebec—</i>				
Spring wheat.....	16.71	1,679,000	18.38	1,827,000
Oats.....	27.00	42,501,000	29.66	48,927,000
Barley.....	24.02	2,604,000	24.49	2,547,000
<i>Ontario—</i>				
Spring wheat.....	17.45	2,176,000	20.19	2,429,000
Winter wheat.....	24.24	14,086,000	25.24	15,376,000
Oats.....	34.75	109,192,000	39.40	128,917,000
Barley.....	29.04	20,952,000	29.75	20,727,000

Total grain yield, Ontario and Eastern Provinces, in 1910:—Spring wheat, 5,722,600 bush.; winter wheat, 15,376,000 bush.; coarse grains, oats and barley, 220,466,600 bush.

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

	Yield per acre, 1909.	Total Yield, 1909.	Yield per acre, 1910.	Total Yield, 1910.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
<i>Manitoba—</i>				
Spring wheat—.....	18·77	52,706,000	13·65	41,159,000
Oats.....	39·76	55,267,000	28·76	41,742,000
Barley.....	29·98	20,866,000	20·21	13,826,000
<i>Saskatchewan—</i>				
Spring wheat.....	23·13	85,197,000	16·73	81,139,000
Oats.....	49·70	91,796,000	31·10	61,367,000
Barley.....	33·28	4,493,000	26·18	3,598,000
<i>Alberta—</i>				
Winter wheat.....	24·80	2,009,000	12·59	1,234,000
Spring wheat.....	24·90	7,570,000	12·32	5,359,000
Oats.....	46·80	38,376,000	24·27	23,644,000
Barley.....	32·25	5,999,000	20·32	3,953,000

Total yield of grain west of Ontario in 1910 :—Spring wheat, 127,657,000 bush.; winter wheat, 1,234,000 bush.; coarse grains, oats and barley, 148,130,000 bush.

By Mr. Chisholm, (Huron):

Q. In regard to the estimate for Saskatchewan, what about the number of acres that are ploughed up, because there were a great many? Will that take away from the average of the others that were not ploughed up but were harvested?

A. The Departmental Statistics, I believe, base their estimate of the average production of crops on the area sown. The total area under crop in the whole Dominion in 1910 was 32,711,062 acres, being an increase of 2,645,506 acres over 1909.

Q. It is quite evident that land that has been ploughed up would, in the estimate, tend to reduce the average?

A. Yes it would. With regard to the yields of cereals in the west, you will notice that the farmers there have a much smaller yield of coarse grains than the farmers in the east have, and of course they have not the same amount of stock to consume it.

RESULTS OBTAINED ON TRIAL PLOTS OF GRAIN ON EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

It may be interesting here to compare the crops we have had during 1910 on the trial plots of grain on the Experimental Farms in the several provinces of the Dominion, as showing the results obtained under the best treatment of the land for these crops. I may say that a Crop Bulletin has just been issued giving full details as to these results.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

In giving you these results, you must bear in mind that they are from plots varying from one-tenth to one-sixtieth of an acre. The difficulty sometimes is to get enough uniform land to permit of the plots being made larger, but the area of land of a uniform character is limited, and we have a great many varieties to test.

APPENDIX No. 1

	Bush.	Lbs. per acre.
<i>Spring Wheat:—</i>		
Average Yield of 16 varieties..	35	48
<i>Oats:—</i>		
Average Yield of 24 varieties..	68	8
<i>Barley, Six-row:—</i>		
Average of 11 varieties..	65	38
<i>Barley, Two-row:—</i>		
Average of 10 varieties..	45	47

EXPERIMENTAL STATION, CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.

<i>Spring Wheat:—</i>		
Average of 13 varieties..	39	19
<i>Oats:—</i>		
Average of 21 varieties..	121	29

That seems a very extraordinary yield for oats, but the yields have been unusually large on Prince Edward Island during the past year. I may say that the measurements of the plots have been very accurately made and the statements of yields here given may be accepted as correct.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Are these plots watered, or do they depend on the natural rainfall?

A. They are not artificially watered, but are treated the same as a field crop.

EXPERIMENTAL STATION, CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.—Continued.

	Bush.	Lbs. per acre.
<i>Barley, Six-row:—</i>		
Average of 11 varieties..	65	38
<i>Barley, Two-row:—</i>		
Average of 10 varieties..	62	19

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, BRANDON, MAN.

<i>Spring Wheat:—</i>		
Average of 8 varieties..	35	14
<i>Oats:—</i>		
Average of 16 varieties..	83	3
<i>Barley, Six-row:—</i>		
Average of 10 varieties..	43	29
<i>Barley, Two-row:—</i>		
Average of 9 varieties..	52	12

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. What were the varieties sown at Brandon?

A. All that information is given in the bulletin to which I referred a moment ago. The varieties sown there were those that we have found to be of the best quality, the earliest and the most productive.

Q. In this record, is there any statement regarding the early ripening qualities of certain varieties?

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

A. Yes the dates of sowing and of ripening of all these different varieties are given. You will find all the needed information in the bulletin which has just been issued.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, INDIAN HEAD, SASK.

The Experimental Farm at Indian Head has given excellent yields during the past season. Here are the figures:—

	Bush.	Lbs. per acre.
<i>Spring Wheat:—</i>		
Average of 7 varieties..	50	14
<i>Oats:—</i>		
Average of 16 varieties..	77	—
<i>Barley, Six-row:—</i>		
Average of 10 varieties..	62	2
<i>Barley, Two-row:—</i>		
Average of 9 varieties..	59	25

EXPERIMENTAL STATION, LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA (NON-IRRIGATED).

<i>Winter Wheat:—</i>		
Average of 9 varieties..	11	3
<i>Spring Wheat:—</i>		
Average of 12 varieties..	11	—
<i>Oats:—</i>		
Average of 16 varieties..	21	13
<i>Barley, Six-row:—</i>		
Average of 10 varieties..	9	12
<i>Barley, Two-row:—</i>		
Average of 9 varieties..	10	13

On the irrigated part of the land where water has been applied the yields have been larger, but the irrigated land this year had not all the advantages it should have had, for the reason that the water was not available until some time in June, owing to the ditches being under repair, and, as the spring was exceedingly dry, an earlier watering of these crops would have been very beneficial.

EXPERIMENTAL STATION, LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA (IRRIGATED).

	Bush.	Lbs. per acre.
<i>Spring Wheat:—</i>		
Average of 4 varieties..	25	52
<i>Oats:—</i>		
Average of 5 varieties..	71	10
<i>Barley, Six-row:—</i>		
Average of 4 varieties..	33	36
<i>Barley, Two-row:—</i>		
Average of 2 varieties..	48	26

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. I notice that winter wheat is not cultivated on the irrigated land at Lethbridge?

A. Winter wheat is grown in that country almost entirely on non-irrigated land, and it usually can be grown to great advantage there. In 1909 we had an average of 27 bush. 11 lbs. per acre from fourteen varieties sown on non-irrigated land.

APPENDIX No. 1

Q. That is as compared with 11 bushels this year?

A. Yes. The season of 1910 was such a wonderfully exceptional season in respect of drought that it is not to be wondered at the crops were small. No such season has been experienced in the memory of the oldest inhabitants in that part of Alberta, and we hope it will not occur again in our time. Still, the average of 11 bushels per acre on 'dry-farming' land is not bad when you consider the averages that are got in those states that border on Canada, where the most of the yields were less.

EXPERIMENTAL STATION, LACOMBE, ALTA.

At the Experimental Farm at Lacombe there were also unusually large returns this year. Some are almost unbelievable, but I think the superintendent has checked the returns very carefully. He furnished me figures of the actual weight of grain grown on each plot and the exact sizes of the plots, and thus every means has been taken to get the returns strictly accurate.

	Bush.	Lbs. per acre.
<i>Spring Wheat:—</i>		
Average of 10 varieties.. . . .	63	7
<i>Oats:—</i>		
Average of 17 varieties.. . . .	74	24
<i>Barley, Six-row:—</i>		
Average of 10 varieties.. . . .	69	34
<i>Barley, Two-row:—</i>		
Average of 9 varieties.. . . .	60	18

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, AGASSIZ, B.C.

	Bush.	Lbs. per acre.
<i>Spring Wheat:—</i>		
Average of 9 varieties.. . . .	26	51
<i>Oats:—</i>		
Average of 17 varieties.. . . .	72	23
<i>Barley, Six-row:—</i>		
Average of 10 varieties.. . . .	39	2
<i>Barley, Two-row:—</i>		
Average of 9 varieties.. . . .	43	14

The details connected with all these figures I have given you will be found in this crop bulletin and a good deal more information in regard to the earliness and adaptability of these special varieties to the different parts of our great Dominion. The outline I have given you shows that the average returns from the plots of grain on the several experimental farms are a long way in advance of the average yields obtained by the farmers of the several provinces. There is no doubt that these latter will materially increase as the farmers gain a better knowledge of their business.

EXPERIMENTAL STATION, FORT VERMILION, ALTA.

Some returns have been received from the experimental station at Fort Vermilion, on the Peace River, Alberta, within the last few days. Fort Vermilion is here and Edmonton here (indicating on the map).

By Mr. Chisholm (Huron):

Q. What is the latitude there?

Hon. Mr. FISHER.—About 58.

Dr. SAUNDERS.—58½ nearly.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. What is the distance of Fort Vermilion from Edmonton?

A. It would be about 400 miles in a straight line and about 700 miles by the mail route, which follows the course of the lakes and rivers. The season of 1910 was earlier there than that of 1909. Seeding was begun on the 26th of April and was general by May 1st. The growth of all crops was very rapid, but on June 28th a frost occurred which injured potatoes, beans and some other tender vegetables. No other set-back occurred until August 14th, when there was a light frost, followed by a heavier one on the 16th, when grain in some parts of the district was injured, although the wheat on the experimental station escaped damage.

Six varieties of wheat were under test, and their average yield from experimental plots of one-sixtieth of an acre each was 43 bushels, 24 lbs. per acre. I have brought two varieties of grain with me to show the Committee. Marquis, which is one of our new early varieties, has given, at Fort Vermilion, a yield of 40 bushels per acre, the wheat weighing 65 lbs. per bushel. The other is a sample of Red Fife, which gave 43 bushels per acre, weighing 62 lbs. per bushel. You will notice that the Red Fife is not very well matured and appears to have been slightly frosted, whereas the Marquis is a very good sample of grain, showing the advantage of using the earlier ripening sort for these far northern districts.

Four varieties of oats were under test and their average yield from similar plots was 69 bushels 16 lbs. per acre.

Three varieties of six-row barley were under trial and the average yield was 55 bushels 29 lbs. per acre. Our superintendent usually sends me, a little later, yields from the fields of the farmers in that district, but I have not yet got those particulars from him.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. How do they compare with the yield from your plots?

A. There is no uniformity at all. Sometimes the plots are lower than the field, but, as a rule, the fields are lower than the plots, sometimes considerably lower. Last year the average in the Peace River country was about 24 bushels of wheat per acre, and I am expecting to hear that the average is pretty nearly the same this year. The season was a little earlier, which gave the wheat a little better chance to mature.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Grown on comparatively new land, I suppose?

A. We made an arrangement with this man for carrying on this experimental work on at least five acres of the best land he could secure. It was all good land for wheat growing. Of course, that district is very far north, and I have not been able to visit it and inspect it myself; but from what we know of the land, I should say it compares favourably with other land in Alberta, but is probably not superior to those lands that the other settlers have under cultivation.

While the yield of wheat in 1910 in Alberta was very low, averaging 12.59 bushels per acre for fall wheat and 12.32 for spring wheat, compared with 24.80 and 24.90 bushels per acre, respectively, in 1909, and the figure given as the average yield in Manitoba, 13.65 bushels per acre, is also low, it is worthy of note that even these lowest yields compare very favourably with those of our neighbours to the south of us.

YIELDS OF PRINCIPAL GRAIN CROPS IN UNITED STATES FOR YEARS 1909 AND 1910.

The following table gives some of the details of the yields of the principal grain crops in the United States for the season of 1910 and of 1909, taken from the 'Crop Reporter,' the official organ of the United States Department of Agriculture. The average yield per acre of the entire wheat crop of that country is given, also that of

APPENDIX No. 1

several States individually, namely, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Minnesota and Nebraska, where the yields, owing to somewhat similar climatic conditions, are to a certain extent comparable with those of the Canadian Northwest.

	Yield per acre, 1910.	Yield per acre, 1909.	Average Yield for ten years.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
<i>Oats—</i>			
United States, entire crop	31.0	31.9	29.5
North Dakota.....	7.5	32.0	29.7
South Dakota.....	23.4	30.0	31.6
Minnesota.....	28.7	33.0	31.7
Nebraska.....	28.0	25.0	26.4
Kansas.....	33.0	22.0	24.4
<i>Barley—</i>			
United States, entire crop	22.4	24.3	25.7
North Dakota.....	5.7	21.0	23.0
South Dakota.....	18.2	19.5	25.3
Minnesota.....	21.9	23.6	25.7
Nebraska.....	18.5	22.0	24.0
Kansas.....	18.0	18.0	19.8
<i>Spring Wheat—</i>			
United States, entire crop.....	11.8	15.8	13.7
North Dakota.....	5.5	10.7	12.1
South Dakota.....	12.8	14.1	12.1
Minnesota.....	16.0	16.8	13.0
Nebraska.....	13.9	14.0	13.0
Kansas.....	8.4	11.5	11.8

FREE DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Grain grown in Canada will average a greater weight per bushel than it does in the United States.

The advantages are, no doubt, partly climatic and partly due to the fact that during the past 24 years a free distribution of the best and most prolific sorts of seed grain obtainable has been made annually to Canadian farmers, the seed being sent in bags of four or five pounds each, free, through the mail. For the past ten years this distribution has averaged more than 40,000 samples, and during this time these samples have reached almost every progressive farmer in the remotest districts of the Dominion. Gradually these better sorts and heaviest croppers have become the common sorts in cultivation. Only one sample is sent out to each applicant, but a sample may be had each year, which will, in a very short time, furnish the farmer with the best varieties of the more important crops at no cost to himself beyond that of his own labour.

The number of farmers receiving this direct benefit from the Central Experimental Farm last year was 39,763. If the number of samples distributed from the branch farms be added, this will bring the number up to a total of about 50,000.

One of the most interesting sorts being sent out this year is a hard red wheat known as Marquis, which is a cross of Red Fife with Hard Red Calcutta, produced at the Central Farm by the Cerealists. This grain is usually from a week to ten days earlier than Red Fife, is equal to Red Fife in quality, and thus far has been more productive.

In 1909 a field of $4\frac{3}{4}$ acres of Marquis, grown at the Experimental Farm at Brandon, Manitoba, produced an average of 52 bushels 18 lbs. per acre. In 1910 a field of $5\frac{1}{2}$ acres at the Experimental Farm at Indian Head, Saskatchewan, averaged 53 bushels per acre. Its weight is 65 lbs. per bushel, 5 lbs. over the standard. A sample of

grain from this field is submitted. The excellent sample of Marquis wheat grown at Indian Head will constitute the larger part of the wheat of this variety to be distributed this year.

This (showing another sample) is an early form of the Red Fife known as Early Red Fife. It is not quite so early as Marquis, but is from four to six days earlier than the ordinary Red Fife. These are the two most interesting varieties being sent out this year. A sample of Marquis is also here submitted which was received from Fort Vermilion, on the Peace River, Alberta, where a plot of this wheat gave a yield at the rate of 40 bushels per acre, weighing also 65 lbs. per bushel. Last spring 2,112 samples of 5 lbs. each of Marquis wheat were distributed free by mail, and a limited quantity sold in lots of from two to five bushels each. The distribution this year will be larger and will provide seed sufficient for sowing a considerable area in the Northwest next year. The demand for the Marquis variety is large this season, and I fear it will be quite impossible to meet all the requests.

'DRY-FARMING.'

The great drought which prevailed during the past season over a large part of the Canadian Northwest has led many farmers to pay more attention to what is known as 'dry-farming,' and to treat their lands in such a way as to conserve the moisture. In the discussion of this subject the field of view occupied is not always broad enough; the annual precipitation is sometimes the only feature taken into account. There are other factors which should be considered, such as the seasonal distribution of the rain the rate at which the rain is precipitated, the kind of soil on which it falls and the loss of water through surface run-off. The amount of loss from evaporation will depend largely on the way the soil is worked.

Roughly speaking, 'dry-farming' is usually considered to be adapted to those regions where the annual rainfall is more than 10 and less than 20 inches. This, however, is only a rough approximation, and it is quite impossible to say where ordinary farming methods should give place to those known as 'dry-farming' methods. 'Dry-farming' is usually understood to mean the adoption of those practices which result in the conservation of moisture.

The method of alternate cropping and summer tillage, known as fallow, is generally recognized to be the most highly developed and successful 'dry-farming' method. This, however, admits of only one crop in two years, and this practice is usually confined to those districts where the yearly rainfall is very light. Where the total precipitation is greater, the plan is usually followed of growing two grain crops in succession, one on fallow and the other on stubble, followed by a season of fallow. In this way the farmer takes from his fields two crops of grain in three years. The good results had from this method have been thoroughly demonstrated at Indian Head, Saskatchewan, by Mr. A. Mackay, who originated this practice, which has been operated for many years in that district. It has been claimed and, I think, with good show of reason, that by ploughing for a fallow in June and the proper use of cultivators and packers throughout the summer, about one-half of the moisture which falls on the fallow during the season may be conserved in the soil and carried over and utilized by the crop the next season. Further, the cultivation of the surface cleans the land from weeds.

The fall of every inch of rain adds to the moisture in each acre 112 tons of water of 2,000 lbs. each. After a heavy shower, if a cultivator can be promptly used, the surface is scratched and loosened and a 'dust-blanket' formed which prevents much evaporation. This practice, associated with the use of a packer when needed to firm the soil, and fallowing the land every second or third year, constitute the main features in connection with 'dry-farming.' But, as conditions vary in almost every district, no

APPENDIX No. 1

unchanging rules can be laid down for general guidance; each man bearing in mind the principles he is to practise, must use his own judgment and common sense in their application.

OUR HERITAGE IN AGRICULTURAL LANDS.

There is one subject which I have often referred to in public addresses, which I should like again to mention briefly this morning. In my twenty-five years of busy occupation in trying to acquire as thorough a knowledge as possible of Canadian agriculture in all its aspects, there is one idea which has impressed me most profoundly, and that is the enormous extent of the agricultural resources of this country. During that period it has been my privilege to travel some thirty times or more over the settled area lying between the Atlantic and the Pacific and to study its conditions and possibilities. Although the impressions on my own mind have been deepened from year to year during my annual or semi-annual visits, I find it very difficult to present the formidable figures which are required to meet this case in such a way as to admit of their being grasped so as to be understood.

Compared with the resources in minerals, forests, fisheries, etc., agriculture far outweighs them all. Although only a very small proportion of the total land area in Canada has yet been laid under tribute, the returns to the nation in agricultural products exceed those from all other sources.

Let us consider for a few moments the volume of our heritage in agricultural lands in the different parts of this great Dominion, and endeavour to get some slight insight into the wonderful agricultural possibilities which are sure to present themselves when the population of Canada shall have become at all proportioned to the size and resources of the country to be developed.

The approximate land surface (exclusive of the water areas) in the several parts of the Dominion are given in official documents as follows:—

Eastern Provinces.	Square Miles.	Acres.
Ontario..	219,650	149,576,000
Quebec..	344,450	220,448,000
Nova Scotia..	20,600	13,184,000
New Brunswick..	28,200	18,048,000
Prince Edward Island..	2,000	1,280,000
Total in acres..		402,536,000
Prairie Provinces.		
Manitoba..	64,066	41,002,240
Saskatchewan..	242,332	155,000,000
Alberta..	251,180	161,000,000
Total in acres..		357,002,240
British Columbia..	382,300	244,672,000

These figures give us a total of about 402,000,000 acres in the eastern provinces, in the three prairie provinces of about 357,000,000 acres and in British Columbia 244,000,000 acres, a grand total of 1,004,000,000 acres.

Besides this, Canada has a land area in the Yukon Territories	Acres.
of about..	125,000,000
In Mackenzie..	307,000,000
Keewatin..	318,000,000
Ungava..	176,000,000

A total in these comparatively unknown territories of about 926,000,000 acres.

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Acres.

Let us suppose that one-third of the land in the eastern provinces is arable, by which is meant of such a degree of fertility as to admit of cultivation or pasture with profit, that gives us. 134,179,000

A larger proportion of rich prairie lands in the west will be suitable for farming; deducting one-half for poor, rocky or swampy ground, which is probably a very liberal estimate, there remains. 178,501,000

In British Columbia, the districts of high altitude occupy so large a proportion of the country that the area cultivable will be small. It would, however, probably be safe to estimate this at one-tenth of the whole, giving. 24,000,000

In all, as probably useful for agricultural purposes. 336,680,000

An area, the magnitude of which it is difficult to conceive of.

By Mr. Chisholm (Huron):

Q. In regard to Fort Vermilion, what is the altitude? Was the farm where the experiments were made in the valley of the river or up on high land?

A. The river is not very deep and the valley is quite shallow. The farm is located a couple of miles from the river.

Q. What would be the altitude?

A. It is 950 feet.

Q. The country there, no doubt, suffers from summer frosts?

A. Yes; but the altitude is not anything like as great as it is at Indian Head, which is 1,924 feet.

By Mr. Campbell:

Q. In looking at these samples of wheat from Indian Head and Vermilion, I see that in the former case the Red Fife wheat is of a much redder colour than the Marquis wheat and in the latter case vice versa, the Red Fife is whiter in colour. Have you any reason to offer for that?

A. I mentioned that, at Vermilion, the Red Fife wheat did not have time to mature before the frost started, and the skin is roughened and somewhat bleached and immature. It weighs 62 lbs. as against 65 lbs. of the other variety.

Q. Is it your experience that frost whitens the grain?

A. It is said to do so sometimes.

Q. Up in our country it blackens the wheat.

Mr. ROBB.—Are you sure that the grain sown was Red Fife?

Q. It looks like White Fife to me?

A. The only wheat sent up there was Red Fife. Before that we were chiefly growing Ladoga from samples sent out years ago, for the reason that it was a week earlier.

Mr. ROBB.—That sample looks more like White Fife than Red Fife.

A. There is no doubt that it is Red Fife, but it is not fully matured and it is weathered, perhaps more by exposure than by frost. There were no samples, either of Red Fife or Marquis, up there until we sent them. Our representative there has had no other seed from which he could grow these varieties. Besides, the samples have been examined by our experts at the farm and pronounced by them genuine.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. I notice that out at the Central Experimental Farm you clip the feeding cattle. What is the advantage of doing that?

APPENDIX No. 1

A. It is to economize labour. We find that when they are clipped they keep much cleaner than when they are not clipped. When the cattle are not clipped, they are likely to be soiled by lying down in their stalls. The practice of clipping makes them much more presentable, and I think it is also much healthier for them; but that is a matter which is more in Mr. Grisdale's, the Dominion Agriculturist's, line, and I believe you are to have an address from him very shortly.

The CHAIRMAN.—If there is no further discussion, we will bring the meeting to a close. I am sure that we have been highly delighted with Dr. Saunders' address. His account of the experimental work that is being carried on at different stations must, I am sure, impress every member of the committee as being of very great value, and it proves to us the extent to which it is possible to develop our returns from agriculture, if the farmers would only pursue more thorough and scientific methods.

NEW EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS.

Dr. SAUNDERS.—There is one thing I have forgotten to call attention to, and that is that steps have been taken within the last few days to establish three new experimental stations in the far north, one at Fort Resolution, a second at Fort Smith and a third at Fort Providence. These three points in the Northwest will carry our experiments about 150 to 200 miles farther north than anything we have before attempted. We hope to have something to report to the committee next year on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think the most important work that our experimental farms are doing is in connection with the experimental stations.

By Mr. Robb:

Q. How do you account for the rot which prevails in potatoes throughout this country this year?

A. I think I would rather leave an explanation of that to our Botanist, who has been studying the matter. It is due to the dissemination of fungous growths, but what it is that controls them in some districts and allows them to spread broadcast in others it would be very difficult to say. There are many things we have to accept and to put up with because we do not know how to control them yet, but we are learning all the time.

The committee adjourned.

Certified correct,

WM. SAUNDERS.

ROTATIONS AND SOIL CULTIVATION

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

COMMITTEE ROOM, No. 30,

WEDNESDAY, January 25, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock, a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Schell, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN.—You have noticed, gentlemen, from the agenda that we are to have an address this morning from Mr. J. H. Grisdale, Dominion Agriculturist, on the subject of 'Rotations and Soil Cultivation; their Influence on Crop Production.' No more important subject could we have than the subject as announced in this notice. It is the very basis and foundation of all successful agriculture. Mr. Grisdale does not need any introduction to this committee. He has appeared before us on former occasions, and I am sure we shall listen with pleasure and with profit to any remarks he has to offer to us this morning. Mr. Grisdale will now address us.

Mr. J. H. GRIDDALE: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen—As has just been indicated the subject of my remarks this morning is 'Rotation and Soil Cultivation; their Influence on Crop Production.' I want to read a small part at the beginning.

CANADIAN CROPS IN 1910.

According to the December 1910 'Census and Statistics Monthly' the total area of field crops in Canada in 1910 was nearly 33,000,000 acres. The crops grown on this land when valued at average market prices are estimated to have been worth something over \$507,000,000. These facts being accepted, the value of the average crop per acre would be about \$15.50. In the 'Census and Statistics Monthly' no estimate is made of the cost of the cultural operations nor of the harvesting of this immensely valuable crop. A fair estimate of the expense of producing the crop, cost of seed and labour, wear and tear of machinery considered, would be about \$9.60 per acre, made up as follows:—

Ploughing.. . . .	\$1.50
Working, preparatory to seeding.. . . .	0.75
Seeding.. . . .	0.20
Seed.. . . .	1.00
Later cultivation and care.. . . .	0.75
Cutting.. . . .	0.30
Hauling and threshing.. . . .	2.00
Twine.. . . .	0.30
Use of machinery.. . . .	0.30
Interest, charges, &c.. . . .	2.50
Total.. . . .	\$9.60

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

An acre of hay will cost less, but an acre of roots or corn will cost very much more; thus things would probably be approximately balanced up. This shows a net profit of nearly \$6 per acre, or say \$195,000,000 profit on the crop of 1910 over and above all cost of production.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM CROPS, 1910.

Now, on the Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, and on that part of it distinguished as the '200 acre farm' crops were grown on a total area of 173.17 acres.

These crops figured at the prices used by the 'Census and Statistics Monthly' in estimating the value of the crops grown in Ontario, are as follows:—

59.34 acres oats—	
54 $\frac{19}{34}$ bushels per acre equals 3,239 bushels, at 36 cents equals..	\$1,166.04
10.25 acres roots—	
695 $\frac{7}{30}$ bushels per acre equals 7,126 bushels at 20 cents equals..	1,425.20
42.93 acres corn—	
15 $\frac{1}{2}$ tons per acre equals 665 tons at \$4.67 equals..	3,105.55
60.65 acres hay—	
3 $\frac{1}{4}$ tons per acre equals 190 $\frac{1}{2}$ tons at \$10.21 equals..	1,945.00
So that the crop on the 173.17 acres was worth \$7,641.79 or \$44.13 per acre.	

The average cost to handle each acre of the 173.17 acres of 'The 200 acre Farm' under crop in 1910 was about \$12.50 (including \$3 per acre for rent or interest charges) made up as follows:—

Ploughing..	\$1.06
Preparation for seeding..	1.12
Seeding..	0.14
Seed..	1.50
Later cultivation, including hoeing..	1.63
Twine..	0.30
Harvesting, housing and threshing..	3.50
Use of machinery..	0.40
Interest charges, &c..	3.00
	<hr/>
	\$12.65

This deducted from the value of the crop, \$44.13 per acre, would leave a margin of \$31.48. If all the land under cultivation in Canada had left such a margin between the cost of cultivation and the value of the crop produced, the net profit would have been not \$195,000,000 as under present conditions but \$1,038,840,000 or five times as great as at present.

CANADIAN CROP POSSIBILITIES.

Using the same figures it will be seen too that our crop would have been worth not \$507,000,000 but \$1,456,000,000. Such results of course would mean very much better systems of farming than now existant. We can scarcely hope to attain the proficiency as farmers that such results would indicate. It is possible, however, for us as a farming nation to do much better than we have been doing and I wish to indicate briefly this morning how I think progress could be made. My remarks will be based primarily on my twelve years' experience at the Central Experimental Farm but also to some extent upon observation made in every province of Canada.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Was the net profit to the farmer greater last year?

A. No. The net profit to the farmer on the average in 1909 was about \$8. In 1910 it was only about \$6 per acre. That is according to such statistics as we have.

Q. How does the difference occur?

A. The grain crop in the west was lighter while in the east the oat crop and the hay and forage corn crops were rather lighter, these shortages account very largely for the difference in the total values and in the net profits per acre.

The average results as given in the 'Census and Statistics Monthly' are gathered in such a way that we have no certainty that they are correct. The figures which the statistician uses in estimating the values of these crops are in some cases, I think, rather too high. For instance, the values put on hay, roots and corn for forage could hardly be considered fair prices. These crops may be worth the prices quoted in some places but they certainly are not in Ontario. At the Central Experimental Farm we fixed prices some years ago to enable us to readily compare the crop values year by year. We put corn ensilage or forage corn at \$2 a ton, roots at \$2 a ton, hay at \$7 a ton—our crop is chiefly clover hay—straw at \$4 a ton and grain at one cent a pound. These values we fixed as being pretty nearly fair, taking one year with another and in this way we have some basis of comparison.

INFLUENCES AFFECTING CROP PRODUCTION.

Now the results obtained by any and every farmer in the way of crop returns and profits depend upon a number of factors including the following among the more important (1) soil and drainage, (2) climate and weather, (3) suitability of the line of farming to the location of the farm or some other features beyond the control of the farmer, (4) rotation followed, (5) character and quantity of fertilizer used, (6) suitability, thoroughness and timeliness of the cultural operations performed, (7) quality and variety of seed sown, (8) harvesting methods, (9) cost of cultural operations.

Now since to attempt to discuss in detail even the least important part of any of the above enumerated considerations affecting crop production would mean hours, you will understand that my remarks must be largely confined to a bare statement of some of the more important facts or findings in connection with our crop production work on the experimental farms. I do not propose this morning to cite detailed experiments in proof of every statement I make, although I have without exception made such experiments. To start to enumerate all these experiments would be to give an amount of detail impossible of going through before this committee on account of the length of time it would occupy.

SOILS AND DRAINAGE.

To begin with soils and drainage. As you know, soils are not controllable; a man must take the soil as he finds it on his farm. He may have, to begin with, something to do with the picking out or selection of his land, but once he is settled on a spot he is perforce compelled to take that land as he finds it and do the best he can with it. Therefore that is a negligible, or almost negligible, quantity except in so far as the methods which are followed should suit the land under cultivation.

The different kinds of soil which a man may have might be mentioned as, coarse gravelly sand, fine sand, light loam, average loam, heavy loam, clay, hard pan and black muck. That includes pretty nearly the whole range of soils as we have them in Canada or in the world. Fortunately we have all these varieties at the Central Farm; unfortunately we very often have them all in one and the same field. As a matter of fact you can hardly travel one hundred yards on any part of the Central Experimental Farm without finding a decided change in the character of the soil.

This has been of great advantage to us in one way: it has enabled us to make a study of the best methods of treating these different soils; but it has been a disadvantage in so far as it has not permitted us to get the very best results from our cultural operations as would have been the case if our soil had been uniform. As you know it is very difficult indeed to so grade the working of a field that one end of that field, or the middle, shall receive certain cultural treatment and the other end get some other treatment. But we have, wherever necessary and wherever possible, divided the fields to soil peculiarities and studied the methods of cultivation of these soils.

TREATMENT OF SOILS.

Reviewing the soils, I may say briefly that we have found coarse gravelly sand a very difficult land indeed to handle. The only salvation is the addition of humus in large quantities. Even when this humus has been added it is almost impossible to get good results from such soil excepting in very wet seasons.

Fine sand is somewhat easier of handling, but here also it is very difficult to insure good results especially in dry seasons; this because fine sand allows water to percolate very rapidly, and it is, therefore, absolutely necessary to add large quantities of humus and get this humus as deep as possible.

Light loam is the soil likely to give best results to the average farmer under average conditions as to weather and location in Canada. We get on light loamy soils good crops of clover, first-class crops of roots and corn, and medium crops of grain. For the farmer in Eastern Canada the above is the way in which the crops should be arranged; get as heavy crops as possible of the forage and do what he can with the grain. At least in my opinion that is the line of farming that should be followed.

Clayey loam is, of course, about as good, because with a good clayey loam one gets good crops of all kinds. The clayey loams are more difficult to handle, but will, we find, give relatively better crops of grain than lighter soils, with possibly not quite such good yields on the average in the case of hoed crops.

Clay is difficult to handle under adverse climatic or weather conditions. When clay is too dry it is exceedingly difficult to get the soil in right condition for the best crop production. It necessitates the addition of a large amount of humus to open it up and make it more porous and put it in better shape for the conservation of moisture; and so far as the handling is concerned it is almost as difficult to succeed with a clay soil as with a light sandy soil or a coarse sandy soil.

Black loams or peaty soils are possibly the most difficult to manage of all. They present so many problems that one might discuss the thing for hours and work for years and still find himself very far from satisfactorily solving the difficult problems these black muck soils present. We are unfortunately troubled with a good deal of land of this kind at the Central Experimental Farm and find it a bother every year. In the first place, it is hard to keep free from weeds. In the second place, it is hard to handle in the spring. In the third place, it is very difficult to get a catch of grass on it, as it is probably the most difficult of all soils to seed down for grass.

DRAINAGE.

Now, in all these soils we have found that good drainage is a most important consideration. No matter how light the soil, if that soil is drained either naturally, if it lies properly or by artificial drainage, the conditions are greatly improved. Even the lightest soils do better when under-drained or when well surface drained than they do when left to themselves. In the cases of loams, clays and black mucks artificial drainage is almost absolutely necessary if good results are to be anticipated. We have tried this over and over again in different fields with surface draining or tile draining, or combining the two, and in every case we have found that draining

APPENDIX No. 1

the soil has added on the average at least 50 per cent to the value of the field, and possibly more. Imperfect drainage, while being a help, is far from being satisfactory. By imperfect drainage I mean insufficient drainage. For instance, a man may put down tiles which are too small or laid too near the surface, or without sufficient fall, and get some results, but to get satisfactory results it is absolutely necessary that tiles be sufficiently large, laid sufficiently deep, that the outlet be free and that the slope be sufficiently steep to insure a fairly rapid flow of water.

If all these conditions are complied with, the results will be such as to pay for the drainage in a very short time. Just to illustrate: The first year I went to the Central Experimental Farm the value of the crop was \$2,700 or thereabouts. I found about 20 per cent of the farm to be imperfectly drained. The man who tiled that part of the land had not put the tiles sufficiently deep and had not given a sufficient outlet. I redrained that 20 per cent the first fall, and the next year the increase in the value of the crop was about \$1,000, which was largely due, I am confident, to the more perfect drainage of that one-fifth of the farm, or an area of about 40 acres. That point has been demonstrated over and over again on every farm where tile drainage has been done, so it is not necessary for me to dwell any longer upon it. I am of the opinion that the best kind of drainage is a combination of surface or ditch drainage and tile drainage. A tile drain system with a supplementary surface drainage system, especially on low-lying land, would allow the surface water to escape in the spring as rapidly as possible. If we have to wait until the ground thaws out to allow of surface water escaping, the water lies too great a length of time on the land and does much harm. Of all the factors making for the improvement of soils, drainage and humus are the two great points. I want to emphasize this latter point further on so I will leave it for the present.

WEATHER OR CLIMATIC CONDITIONS.

Now, after we have considered soil and drainage, naturally the weather or climatic conditions come next. Adverse climatic conditions in my experience very frequently resolve themselves into poor drainage, faulty cultural methods and unsuitable varieties of grain in use. Many a man has said: 'The weather has been so bad this year that I have had very poor crops.' I am in a position to say that in many cases that man was mistaken. The poor crops which he harvested were due not to the weather conditions but to his own faulty handling of his farm. Had he drained that land properly, had he handled it when it should have been worked, had he done everything at the right time and in the right way, the probabilities are—in fact, the certainty is—that he would have had very much more than an average crop, a very much better crop than he really did have. I have seen this demonstrated, not at the Experimental Farm, but across the road on exactly similar land, but land that was differently handled. I have seen crops not one-tenth as good as the crops at the Experimental Farm and the failure due almost entirely to faults along the lines I have mentioned.

SOIL MOISTURE CONTROL.

Now there are other points which have to do with the control of the moisture, for that is really what it amounts to. Weather means moisture. Of course, we must have heat too, but moisture is the principal factor; and the conditions controlling that are, right tillage, proper rotation and the performance of cultural operations at the right time and, of course, the right operations. For instance, a man growing corn might decide that it would be advisable for him to hill up all his corn. If he hilled it up and the weather turned dry afterwards, the probabilities are that he would lose several dollars per acre on his corn crop, probably 15 to 20 or 25 per cent

of the crop of corn that might otherwise have been his. I have seen that demonstrated over and over again—not near the Experimental Farm merely, but in many other places—the results being marked, indeed, in favour of the flat or level cultivation.

SUIT THE LINE OF FARMING TO THE LOCATION.

After the weather and climate we may consider the suitability of the line of farming to the location or to the district in which a man finds himself. In the first place many men find themselves in such locations that it seems almost impossible to carry on any other kind of farming than what we call grain farming. To start with, grain farming is no doubt permissible or advantageous; but in my opinion one should very soon get into some kind of mixed farming. Mixed farming is the second stage and one should not be long in reaching it, as is demonstrated amply by results which have been observed in eastern Canada, in Ontario and all through the west. We must get into mixed farming if we are to make a success of our agricultural operations; and the fact that many of our farmers are content to continue as grain growers is one of the most important factors making for low returns per acre on our cultivated land in Canada. Mixed farming includes, of course, live stock, and if conditions are such as to make it profitable, the introduction of dairy cattle will make it still more profitable. In an investigation which I carried on some few years ago in Ontario I found that the net profit of the farmer was considerably greater on the farm where dairying was carried on than in other lines of farming. However, a man must, as I said before, consider the location in order to suit his possible production to what he can market the most profitably and the most economically.

THE ROTATION FOLLOWED.

Rotation, as already indicated, is probably the most important factor of all in making for profitable returns from farming. Parkman in his histories of early Canada, speaking of agriculture among the Indians some three hundred years ago, said their method was to clear a piece of land, grow corn on it and keep on growing corn year after year until no more corn would grow. Then, instead of trying to improve the soil, they abandoned their cabins and moved over to the next lot or township and repeated the process. Now, that is pretty nearly the line followed by many of our farmers to-day. Many of us are not much ahead of the savage in our agricultural operations. We must make a change. We can change very easily, that is introduce a longer rotation. The above is what you might call a one-year rotation the same crop year after year. It is modified in the west somewhat by the introduction of the summer-fallow, which helps to keep the land clean, but which also helps to deplete it of its fertility.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR IN A ROTATION.

The fact of rotation being advantageous has been known for many years. The earliest Romans knew of the value of the rotation to a certain extent, and the best European and British agriculturists, without exception I do believe, follow some rotation on their farms. I visited many farms in Great Britain and never saw a farm on which there was not some rotation being followed. Rotation is an exceedingly important consideration in the production of crops; it affects cost very materially and aids greatly in the maintenance of fertility. In deciding upon the rotation to follow there are a few things one must consider carefully.

In the first place we want to get the greatest crops. It is all right to talk of conserving the fertility of our land, but at the same time we are dependant on the crops we get from it. Therefore, any rotation which is not likely to give as good returns

APPENDIX No. 1

per acre as we can get by following the old system of grain farming or some system similar should not be introduced.

In looking for a rotation we must consider the getting of the biggest returns possible. We want also the lowest possible expenditure for labour. One might take a piece of land and running it as a garden get a thousand dollars an acre for the products, as is done in some parts of Canada, cultivating special crops and getting immense returns, but at a great cost for labour and fertilizer. We, as farmers, however, cannot do that; we must consider the smallness or cheapness of the labour required by the land under rotation to get the best results.

Then again, a rotation that gave us big returns, that did not cost very much relatively for labour, but that left our farm poorer at the end of the period of time, would still be a most objectionable rotation. We must have a rotation that will leave our land better year by year. If you can follow a rotation which insures big crops, produces cheaply and leaves your farm in better shape year by year, then you have nearly all the requirements of the ideal rotation.

The rotations I propose to describe will fulfil these rather exacting requirements. Some will give you better results than others. Some will mean a little more labour or expense than following grain farming would entail, but in any case they will fulfil the two requirements of a good rotation, giving good crops and leaving the soil in much better condition at the end of the period of time.

Of course, in fixing upon the rotation to be followed one has to bear in mind several other considerations. In the first place he must consider his soil. A man who is going in for the growing of corn might not find it advisable to pick out a low-lying clay land or undrained land on which to start his operations. He could, of course, work up to it in a sort of way under these conditions, but it would need a lot of preparation. He must also consider the use he proposes to make of his rough produce once it is garnered, whether for dairy cattle, beef cattle, sheep, swine or whatever line of husbandry he prefers. These considerations must all enter very largely into the question of the rotation to be followed.

THE TWO-YEAR ROTATION.

I have mentioned already the one-year rotation where a man grows the same crop year after year. Let me merely mention a two-year rotation, grain alternately with clover. This rotation is not suitable for the average farmer, although it is a rotation which, owing to our favourable climatic conditions in Canada, could be followed, and is a rotation which would certainly give exceedingly good results to the man who felt he had to grow grain and hay almost exclusively.

THE THREE-YEAR ROTATION.

A rotation which I can recommend to any who might think of going into dairying or live stock raising, is a three-year rotation, a rotation which we have tried for the last seven or eight years at the Experimental Farm and found exceedingly satisfactory. First year, corn for forage; second year, grain; third year, clover. The third year of the rotation field might be divided and used one part for hay and one part for pasture. It is a rotation peculiarly suited to the man who has only part of his farm on arable land, the rest being pasture land, or rough land which he could use for that purpose without breaking into his cultivated land. It is a rotation which will give really remarkable results in the way of crop returns, as I shall show in a few minutes.

THE FOUR-YEAR ROTATION.

The four-year rotation is somewhat longer but almost as satisfactory and allows for pasture, thus:—corn, grain, clover hay, pasture, or pasture then hay interchanging

the last two years. I may say that pasturing the first year after grain has proven most profitable wherever tried and I believe is the best method of pasturing, especially if a man does not count on feeding much hay during the winter. Pasturing during the first year when the land is full of clover is the year when it will give by far the greatest and best results as pasture land.

FIVE YEAR ROTATIONS.

We have tried various five-year rotations, thus: Corn, grain, hay, hay, grain; another one: corn, grain, hay, grain, hay. They have proved almost equally satisfactory. However, I prefer the one where there is a break between the two years of hay. Then, there are rotations suitable for grain farming, or rather suitable for farming where grain is a more important consideration. That is, a rotation such as this: corn or hoed crop, grain, hay, hay, grain. You would have about one-half of the land under grain, two years in hay and one year in hoed crop. In this way, good use can be made of all the fertilizers produced on the farm. The hay crop would be sufficient along with the hoed crops for the maintenance of considerable stock, and the farmer might be said to be carrying on mixed farming in its best form. Now, including those rotations we have been trying ten or twelve different rotations on the Central Experimental Farm. Fixing crop values as already indicated, \$2 per ton for corn and roots, \$7 a ton for hay, a cent a pound for grain and \$4 a ton for straw, the rotations gave returns as follows: Five-year rotation (the one with the break or grain crop between the two years hay) \$23.10; three-year rotation: corn, grain and pasture, \$27.45; four-year rotation with shallow ploughing, \$25.59; four-year rotation with deep ploughing, \$25.45. The three-year rotation—where pasturing the swine was a part of the rotation—and constituted one year of it, \$28.43; the four-year rotation where pasturing with sheep was one year of the rotation—one year and a half you might say, \$19.53. You notice quite a difference in the returns per acre under these different rotations. The labour item was of course somewhat different, but the net profit after paying for labour and everything were about as follows: First, five-year rotation, \$8.79; second five-year rotation, \$8.70; three-year rotation, corn, grain and hay, \$9.56; four-year rotation, shallow cultivation, \$7.60; four-year rotation deep cultivation, \$7.39; the pig rotation, \$8.05; sheep rotation, \$3.80. I might say in explanation of the sheep rotation that it probably should not have come in here for the reason that the area on which it is carried on includes some very poor soil. I think we did not get more than 50 or 60 per cent of a crop off the fields in this rotation due to the kind of soil. It is an old quarry which we have been trying to fill up, and it is really not comparable with the other fields, but I mention it to show that we are doing something in that line.

CHARACTER AND QUANTITY OF FERTILIZER.

Having considered the rotation, one next has to consider the fertilizer which shall be used on the land even although you are following the rotation suitable for the improvement of the soil and for the increasing of the crop returns. The addition of fertilizers to our soils is an absolute necessity. Agriculture the world over has come to recognize the need of fertilizer of some kind.

WHAT IS MEANT BY FERTILIZER.

Fertilizer is a very broad word; it means everything that will make a crop grow. For instance, if you put salt on a crop of mangels or on a crop of barley there will be results, that is, you will see increased returns. Now salt, sodium chloride, contains no element that enters into the composition of the average plant, yet it will, if applied in moderation, increase the return per acre of the two crops mentioned.

APPENDIX No. 1

Therefore you may say that salt is a fertilizer although it really contains no plant food.

BARNYARD MANURE THE FARMER'S FERTILIZER.

The average farmer in Canada need pay attention to only one kind of fertilizer, barnyard manure, at least such is my opinion based upon our own experience and confirmed by observing the experience of farmers from one end of this Dominion to the other. There may, of course, be special cases, when orcharding or some special line of farming is being carried on, where commercial fertilizers would be advisable. Mixed commercial fertilizers as found in Canada to-day are, to begin with, not very economical material. They contain in many cases considerable proportions of adulterants, which have no fertilizing value at all. If a farmer felt that he must use commercial fertilizers the best plan would be for him to buy pure fertilizers of some description or other and mix them himself. Muriate of potash, superphosphate and nitrate of soda supply the different elements required for plant growth. Commercial fertilizers, as stated, have some value because of the elements of plant food necessary for crop production.

HUMUS.

But, we find in Ottawa, and I have found wherever I have had the opportunity of witnessing experiments along these lines, that the most important material making for soil fertility is humus. Getting decayed or rotten vegetable matter into the soil is worth infinitely more than adding any amount of commercial fertilizer, or of plant food in the form of mixed fertilizer. Getting this humus into the soil and following the rotations I have mentioned, are the most important considerations. For instance, the three-year rotation leaves a fine clover sod to turn under when it is in its very best form. Our experiments at the Central Experimental Farm during the last few years have demonstrated that such clover sod is worth from \$10 to \$12 per acre to the crop following it. Now that would seem like an exceedingly cheap way of fertilizing one's farm, as it really is. If in addition to this clover we can add a considerable amount of barnyard manure, then we have very nearly ideal conditions. The application of this barnyard manure at short intervals rather than in larger quantities at long intervals, is the better plan. Our experiments show that one of the chief advantages of the short rotations is the fact that the manures can be applied and are likely to be applied in smaller quantities at shorter intervals.

APPLYING BARNYARD MANURE.

The method of applying barnyard manure is a much debated, and, one might say, a vexed question, but we have found that applying it in winter will give very satisfactory results. We, therefore, put it on when the teams and men can be so employed to the greatest advantage; that is, when time is not the question of great importance it is in spring when getting the seed into the ground. If it is left until the spring it has to be put on when other work has to be done and consequently time is lost. The quantity, as I have already stated, should not be very great each time.

THE QUALITY OF THE MANURE.

The quality is a matter of importance. Many a farmer in these eastern parts of Canada thinks he is giving a good dressing of manure to his land when he puts on, we will say, 15 or 20 tons. He is often really giving a very light dressing. Many cattle are poorly fed and such a dressing, 15 to 20 tons per acre, has no greater manurial value than 8 or 10 tons of good barnyard manure where the cattle are properly fed. I mean to say that the manure made by cattle fed on straw and poor

feeds of that description has very small manurial value indeed. The farm on which cattle are well looked after and well fed is the farm on which every ton of manure is worth anywhere from fifty to one hundred per cent more than where the reverse is the case.

OTHER METHODS OF INCREASING HUMUS.

In addition to barnyard manures, another method of improving the physical condition of the soil—and without perfect physical condition we cannot possibly get good crop results—is to turn down what are known as green manures, such as sod, peas, buckwheat, vetches or anything else that will grow for a time. In the west they let their weeds grow for two or three months until just before danger or seeding point is reached, and then turn them under. The weeds so treated constitute a green manure and have considerable value in adding humus and fibre to the soil. Green manuring, so called, is, however, an expensive method of improving the soil, at least for the eastern farmer, because it takes too much time, time that the field should spend producing forage or grain, and time that the farmers should spend looking after paying crops. As farmers we cannot afford to waste any more time, either our own time or the field's time, than is absolutely necessary, and I consider the spending of a year's time to increase the amount of humus in a soil to be an exceedingly great waste indeed. Besides this, we can grow certain crops in our rotations. As already mentioned, growing clover in the rotation will add very materially to the fertility of the soil. So, also, the growing of peas will be found to be of value in this connection. In fact, the growing of any crop that will leave a considerable residue, otherwise useless, to be turned under and allowed to decompose will be found a great help in the upbuilding of the soil. In following any rotation much can be done to secure the best results in crop returns by ploughing at such times as will insure the largest amounts of vegetable matter to turn under. For instance, in the ploughing and preparing of our land for corn at the General Experimental Farm the best results are secured when we turn the clover sod with the manure under in the spring, say about the middle of May. This always means the turning under of a good growth of grass and clover and very materially benefits the corn crop.

CULTURAL OPERATIONS.

After the rotation has been fixed upon and the fertilizer has been at least anticipated and arrangements made for its application, the proper performance of all cultural operations at the right time—that is, the suitability, thoroughness and timeliness of cultural operations—is the next consideration. Many farmers lose much time each spring by slowness in getting out on their lands. It is possible, of course, to start operations too early, but the farmer must know enough of his business to be able to judge when his land is ready for the application of fertilizers or when it is fit for seeding, and then, the great point, get that seeding done as soon after the land is ready as at all possible. Earliest seeding will mean anywhere from five to ten per cent increase in yield, as has been demonstrated over and over again at our Experimental Farms. The fitness of soil means its temperature and the moisture content. We cannot control the moisture content until we begin to work, but we can provide for taking off the surplus surface moisture and when we do that the temperature of the soil is raised. One most important point in fitting land for seeding in spring is to get on to it as early as possible with a harrow, prevent evaporation, and so raise the temperature and get the land fit for seed germination as soon as that seed is sown. The crop to be grown has, of course, a great deal to do with the treatment that should be given the land. As I mentioned a minute ago, in preparing for corn at the Experimental Farm we plough sod land in the spring. Spring ploughing is not advisable for most crops, but for corn production in Eastern Canada it is

APPENDIX No. 1

undoubtedly one of the best methods of getting a big yield. When I say ploughing in the spring, however, I mean turning a very light furrow, the land then to be worked down as firmly as possible. No seed should be sown until the sod that has just been turned down—including barnyard manure and all the grass and clover growing on it—is worked down to a level, smooth surface so that a horse walking over it does not sink more at one spot than at any other. If the growing of grain is intended it is advisable to plough in the fall when the land will have a chance to break down under the action of frost and so become pulverized and aerated. Fall ploughing likewise permits one to do the necessary cultivation, harrowing, &c., early in the spring. Therefore, as I say, the crop to be sown is an important consideration in deciding upon the time when the cultural operations should be performed.

Thoroughness in all cultural operations is an exceedingly important point. The man who harrows, or ploughs, or sows, or cultivates, in a half-hearted kind of way gets a half-hearted kind of crop every time. We have proven this to our own satisfaction over and over again at the Experimental Farm. After cultivating until one would think the field must be sick of the process, or until it looks as though one had overdone the thing and were adding unnecessarily on the expense of the preparation of the soil it is usually well to do a little more. I have almost invariably found 'another little run over' after all seemed right, to be the proper thing. It is almost impossible to too thoroughly prepare the soil provided the power available and father time will permit. It will not be advisable, generally speaking, to over-prepare and so neglect the proper time of seeding; but thorough preparation if time will permit, is the most profitable thing that can be done in the way of getting ready to grow crops. Some years ago, one day when walking across some three or four year old meadows, I was astonished to be able to trace quite distinctly the marks of the plough made when preparing the land for seeding several years previous to my visit. I could, I believe, take you next spring and show you such fields in this very Canada of ours. Very small crops result from such preparation. The farmers who so handle their fields are the men who are responsible for the present low crop returns from our broad acres.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Before you leave that point, I wish to ask you one question. You say that by cultivation you raise the temperature of the soil. Have you ever attempted to ascertain to what extent you raised the temperature or whether you raised it very much or not?

A. Yes, I have made the experiment and have succeeded in raising the temperature four or five degrees.

Q. In a given time?

A. In about a day or a day and a half.

Q. That would be very desirable for corn because it requires heat in the soil above all other grain.

A. We find too that in growing corn if there comes rain when the corn is planted and the soil becomes cold, running over it with a harrow prevents evaporation, facilitates percolation and raises the temperature, then the corn comes up much more rapidly.

Q. It prevents the corn from rotting?

A. Yes, and hastens growth.

THE IMPLEMENT TO USE.

A great many farmers make the mistake of using unsuitable harrows, or using harrows which greatly increase the expense of the operation. For instance in many parts of Canada a spring tooth harrow is very commonly used for getting sod land ready for grain, whereas no worse implement could be found or devised for this purpose. One might think that all the powers of evil had been working to devise such

an instrument for such a purpose. It does more to root up the soil, to leave it in bad condition for sowing, it does more to cause the farmer to leave his field badly prepared or half prepared for seeding, or in bad shape after seeding than any other method or instrument that I have ever seen in use. It is an exceedingly objectionable implement, yet I regret to say there are very many in use in Canada to-day. We could and we should—and I am glad to say we gradually are—substituting disc harrows in place of these objectionable spring toothed instruments of soil torture now in use. The best form of disc in my opinion is the double cutaway. This instrument has done a great deal to cheapen the cost of preparing the land and to improve the condition of it.

Q. Then, if I understand correctly, you object to the spring tooth harrow?

A. Yes.

Q. What difference is there between that and the cultivator?

A. A cultivator is an instrument we use as a rule when the land is in roots or corn to free it from weeds, or it could be used to rip up an unploughed sod field. It is an instrument for ripping up rather than preparing the land for grain. The spring tooth harrow is very commonly used to prepare sod land for seeding after it has been ploughed. It has the effect of filling up some of the interstices in the ploughed land. It also, however, rips up the sod and gives the land an exceedingly bad appearance at the same time, as it leaves it in bad shape for crop production. In getting land ready for seeding one absolute requirement is that the land shall be firm, that there shall be no open spaces anywhere below the surface. The spring-tooth harrow—not the spring-tooth cultivator, because you would not use that implement under such conditions—has the effect of making the subsoil full of openings, and should droughty weather come on shortly after the seeding is performed the man who has used such a harrow is sure to experience very considerable loss from poor crop returns.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. Would you discourage the use of the spring-tooth harrow?

A. Yes, for sod the best harrow is the disc harrow. You should roll the land, then disc, then roll again and disc again. That is the best preparation for sod land, no matter what the crop to be sown. The use of the roller between the cuttings of the disc harrow is a practice we have found profitable and advantageous in the getting of land cheaply and quickly into condition for seeding. The roller packs the sod and holds it in place, the disc harrow cuts and pulverizes the soil and fills in all interstices in the ploughed land.

By Mr. Douglas:

Q. Does that apply all through Canada, to western land as well as land in the east?

A. In the case of Western Canada if you were breaking either meadow land or virgin prairie and decided to cultivate rather than to backset that would be true.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Would you not after the disc harrow, use a finetooth harrow?

A. Oh, yes, after you have got the soil packed down well and a good surface then the spike-toothed harrow is the proper treatment.

THE BROADCAST SEEDER NOT RECOMMENDED.

I would not use a broadcast seeder. The broadcast seeders in use in this country are another source of loss and a means of increasing the cost of crop production. They are dangerous implements just as are spring-tooth harrows.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Why?

A. Because they sow unevenly, and when I say unevenly I mean that some of the seed is likely, in fact certain, to be buried deep in the soil, some less deeply, some with but a very light covering indeed, and more or less of the grain is sure to be left exposed. In this way from 10 to 50 per cent of the seed is likely to be lost and there is a danger of the crop that does grow being of lower quality or grade than would have been the case had a drill seeder been used. When sown right on the sod the seed very often slips down between the furrows. If the land be then worked down that seed is lost entirely. Then some is lost on the surface, being uncovered at all, some is buried deeply although not so deeply as to prevent growth and some buried but slightly comes up quickly. Thus, one gets an uneven growth right on through the growing season. One loses a lot of seed and gets bad results. The broadcast horse seeder is therefore, I say, an implement that should not be used in Canada. I am glad to say it is not used very extensively west of here, but east of here it is still much in evidence.

Q. Many farmers seed both ways. They seed one way with a lighter crop and then reverse the seeder and seed it the other way?

A. For grain?

Q. Yes.

A. That would be the ideal way to sow, but it doubles the cost.

Q. Yes, but they get the crop.

A. It is the way we sow all our grass seed, even though it does cost more, but we find it very profitable. As to sowing grain that way I have not considered that it would be worth the extra labour required. We sow our seed very cheaply. We use large implements at the farm and we sowed our grain last year for 15 cents an acre. Adding 15 cents more by sowing it twice would, I think, be a loss. I may say we have been able to get good results by not sowing before the land was thoroughly prepared. That is the important point.

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. What sort of seeder do you use?

A. A single disc seeder, 20-marker.

By Mr. Chisholm (Huron):

Q. Can you explain to us why harrowing raises the temperature of the soil?

A. Yes, the explanation is simple. Land left undisturbed for any length of time forms a kind of crust or firm layer on the surface, as you will observe. Such a crust forms very quickly after a rain. Moisture comes up through the pores or small openings in this crust and evaporates. Now, to change a pound of water from water to steam or gas demands an enormous amount of heat. I am not in a position to say how much exactly, but probably enough to change the temperature of a square foot of earth three inches deep as much as 15 or 20 degrees.

Q. It becomes latent?

A. Yes. It takes an enormous amount of heat to change the water in the soil to vapour and the necessary heat comes in large part from the soil. As soon as you stop evaporation you prevent the loss of heat and thus give the soil a chance to warm up under the sun's rays.

Q. Another reason is that you blacken the soil?

A. Yes, that is another reason.

THE ROLLER.

Now, as to rolling. The roller is an implement much misused in Canada. One use which might be made of it is in the preparation of the soil for seeding. I can hardly recall seeing a farmer in all these eastern parts using his roller in preparing his soil for seed. Nevertheless that is the best place to use it. It is in this connection that its use will be found most profitable and most effective. After the seed is sown, whether it should be used or not will depend upon the character of the land and the weather conditions. In very damp seasons it would be inadvisable to use it. In dry seasons using the roller after seeding then following with a light harrow again is the ideal treatment. Where seeding to grass with the grain crop, it is usually necessary to roll in order to get the small grass seeds covered. To bring moisture from the subsoil to the small grass seeds near the surface, that these same seeds may be under conditions suitable for plant growth, rolling is necessary and it is then seldom advisable to harrow after rolling. A subsequent harrowing with a light harrow might not do much harm when weather conditions were right. Where the soil is very light passing twice or three times with the roller after seeding has been found to be advantageous. Especially is this plan advisable in the case of black muck soil. I know of no treatment of black muck which will ensure as good results as rolling once before seeding and two or three times after seeding. There seems to be a lack of moisture near the surface in the case of black mucks. Repeated rolling compacts the surface soil and induces moisture to ascend to within a short distance of the surface, a very necessary condition. Under average weather conditions in Eastern Canada such a treatment is very necessary to get grass seed catch, and grass or hay is about the most profitable crop to grow on such soils.

THE SOIL PACKER.

In the west and in some places in the east we have another implement similar to the roller in its action on the soil—the soil-packer. It is of various forms, the subsoil packer, the surface packer and the combination packer. These three are all on the market, and I am not prepared to say which is best. We have a combination machine which we have found exceedingly valuable, especially in the preparation of corn land. Getting the land ready for corn is a difficult operation in the spring. It is, however, an operation which it is exceedingly important should be well done, and the packer we find of great value in this connection. It is an expensive implement at present, but probably the price will be reduced when the machine is better known and is more commonly used.

SPACING THE ROWS.

Now, the space between rows in the seeding is a matter of some importance. We find that 7 inches between rows suits best here. Many people in the west tell me that the 7-inch space suits there also, although on our Experimental Farms in the west we have not found that 7 inches was any better than 6 inches between rows.

QUANTITY OF SEED TO SOW.

This is largely a matter of opinion or possibly of season. We have seen exceedingly good results from sowing a bushel of oats per acre and just as satisfactory returns from sowing three bushels. The quantity to sow cannot be determined when the seeding is going on. The best rule to follow, I think, is to sow a moderate quantity, say $2\frac{1}{2}$ bushels oats per acre. If the season is very favourable with lots of moisture, lots of rain, then a light seeding is satisfactory. If the season is very dry, if there is insufficient moisture in the soil, then a larger quantity of seed is preferable. The safest rule is to sow a moderate quantity, $2\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of oats or thereabouts; in the case of barley, about 2 bushels per acre, and wheat about 5 pecks per acre.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Sinclair:

Q. How much grass seed would you use?

A. If you are using clover I would suggest about ten pounds of red clover, two or three pounds of alsike and ten to twelve pounds of timothy as a good mixture. At the Experimental Farm we do a little better or a little worse, adding five or six pounds of alfalfa seed per acre to the just mentioned quantities of seed. Alfalfa is a crop supposed to be difficult to get well started in many parts of Canada, but I find it can be readily started by adding a few pounds of the seed per acre to the mixture of grasses and clovers as land is put down to hay or grass. In that way it becomes almost a natural growth all over the farm. It is only on spots where water lies in the winter that it does not readily grow and last for years at the Experimental Farm at the present time. Twelve years ago it would not grow anywhere on that farm except on some small plots in front of the poultry house. Now, as you, who have visited the Experimental Farm in summer may have noticed, it will start to grow anywhere on the farm, and as just stated, will last for years where not drowned out in winter.

By Mr. Douglas:

Q. And at Indian Head also?

A. Yes, at Indian Head also.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. How do you account for that?

A. It is the result of the inoculation of the soil by bacteria which makes the growth of alfalfa rapid and successful.

Q. You say you sow two or three pounds of alfalfa to the acre?

A. Yes.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. And you think you can inoculate the soil artificially?

A. Yes, we have done it quite successfully.

By Mr. Douglas:

Q. You attempted the same thing at Lacombe, did you not?

A. Yes, we did.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. You use alfalfa along with common red clover in order to eventually produce a body of alfalfa?

A. Yes, for inoculating the soil with alfalfa.

Q. Would not orchard grass do? It would be easier to produce a heavy crop of orchard grass.

A. Yes, but I may say that I am not very much in favour of orchard grass for certain reasons. In the first place it gives only one crop a year. In the second place it is a bunch grass and it is difficult to get an even stand. In the third place it does not mature; it comes up too soon for our haying operations in the spring and early summer.

Q. It would come up all right with the alfalfa though?

A. Yes, with the very first cut of alfalfa.

Q. And you will get your two or three cuts of orchard grass with the alfalfa?

A. We have never been able to get much after the first crop.

Q. I am experimenting with a very small piece of ground. I was intending to put in fifteen acres or so of alfalfa this year, and the question to my mind was, what grass to mix with it.

A. Do you want eventually to let the orchard grass standing?

Q. My idea would be to get the alfalfa to stand, but it will be necessary to inoculate it.

A. I would advise you not to sow such an extensive area of alfalfa this spring on that land. If you want to get that land eventually to produce alfalfa, my suggestion would be to seed it down in your regular way, adding two or three pounds of alfalfa seed per acre to the regular mixture you have been using. Then the next time you come round to the grass seeding year, you will have a good chance of getting that field down to alfalfa, and when you do that put it down to pure alfalfa; do not add any other mixture of grasses or clovers. An admixture of grasses or other clovers has the effect of eventually killing the alfalfa, the grasses and clovers being hardier in this climate than is alfalfa.

Q. But with a view of inoculating the land you put in the red clover with the alfalfa?

A. That is all right, that is very satisfactory, indeed, and makes splendid hay.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Is it not a fact that orchard grass kills alfalfa?

A. I think so, it spreads so much. Most grasses grown in Canada will in very few years kill out alfalfa.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. Alfalfa is very conservative, it wishes to monopolize the ground itself?

A. Yes, it does not like any rivals.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. What success did you have where you put down two or three pounds of alfalfa?

A. The first year this was done on a field the alfalfa grew, although with a rather feeble growth, but apparently with sufficient vigour to provide for soil inoculation since the crop or catch has been invariably good on succeeding seedings. It is certainly the best plan I know of for inoculating the soil. It is a better plan for inoculation than the use of the bacterial preparations which are on the market. While these do good in some cases, very often the farmer who receives them is not sufficiently careful in following directions to get the best results. If you take a bag of inoculated soil from an old alfalfa field and scatter it on the land it is desired to seed down you get the inoculation almost at once without any trouble, because that soil being in a considerable mass conserves enough moisture in itself to preserve the life of the bacteria. We send out occasionally sacks of soil from fields recently under alfalfa, not only from Ottawa but from all our farms where alfalfa is grown.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. If that practice becomes too prevalent you will soon give away your whole farm.

A. We gave away only a few tons last year. The farmers pay the freight. We furnish the bags.

Q. What has been your experience in pasturing alfalfa?

A. It is the best pasture there is.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. Not with cattle. For sheep and hogs it would be all right?

A. Not for sheep. Hogs pasture it down well. If you had happened to visit the Farm last year you would have seen three acres pastured by hogs. They certainly like it and do well on it.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. I think you can qualify your observation in regard to sheep. I have had a good deal of experience in pasturing sheep on alfalfa. I always pasture our show sheep on alfalfa. Our whole flock are largely pastured in that way and we do not find that result; we do not find that it destroys the alfalfa.

A. That is true for this reason: Your show sheep are well fed and do not browse very closely. We have tried it at the Experimental Farm at Ottawa where very often we are short of grass, and I tell you that when the sheep get going down close there is not much alfalfa left. But if you can give your sheep a large enough area to ensure their having sufficient feed without eating too closely to the surface of the soil, there is no reason why it would not do well.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. Pasturing them on it for a very short time?

A. Or giving them a large enough area so that they will get enough food without browsing too close to the surface. I could show you a field of alfalfa that we had sheep on last summer, but we supplemented the pasture by giving them some cut feed. It was only a small field, but by taking this precaution they did not do any harm; if, however, you allow sheep to graze too closely they will certainly destroy the alfalfa stand.

By Mr. Todd:

Q. In what range of climate can alfalfa be grown?

A. That is a thing we do not know. Twenty-five years ago a Canadian who ventured the statement that alfalfa could be grown in the Northwest would have been laughed at. To-day we are growing profitable crops at Brandon, Indian Head, Lacombe and Lethbridge. At Lacombe it was doing splendidly last fall.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. Alfalfa can be grown twenty-five miles north of Ottawa?

A. I do not doubt it. I have seen it myself growing at Chicoutimi, Lake St. John, Que. It was not doing very well there, but I thought it was due to the preparation of the soil rather than to climatic conditions.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. Is it not possible to procure samples of alfalfa that can be grown in the northern extremities of Canada?

A. We have secured samples from Northern Siberia which seem to be hardier than the common alfalfa that is grown in Ontario or in the Southern or Western States of the American Union. But we have not sufficient knowledge as yet to pronounce one way or the other. Alfalfa seems to be extending its habitat northward and undoubtedly has great adaptability. Its growth is certainly extending farther north and I hope to see the time when abundant crops will be produced in those parts of Canada where its cultivation cannot be depended upon with certainty.

By Mr. Sinclair:

Q. How many crops do they calculate on in Western Canada?

A. I went over a field last year at Indian Head where they had cut alfalfa for five years.

Q. I mean in one year?

A. You can count on two first class crops, and if the season is favourable, that is, if there is sufficient moisture, on three good crops.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. I think you are pretty sure of three crops if the ground is kept well manured?

A. We are sure of three crops here in Eastern Canada.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. If alfalfa is so valuable for pasture purposes why mix it with these other other foods? The other crops may not mature at the same time and in that way you would interfere with the cutting of alfalfa.

A. Do you mean for pasturing on for hay?

Q. Or for other purposes?

A. Well for hay I do not advise to mix it, and I think if you had heard my answers to Senator Owens you would have heard me advise him not to mix alfalfa with anything else, but rather to sow it pure. We use from six to eight pounds of alfalfa, as much red clover, two or three pounds of alsike and six pounds of timothy per acre for our regular pasture mixture. That is for pasture for the first year.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. Some experiments were conducted through the Experimental Union in the province of Ontario last year where quite a lot of alfalfa was sown late in the spring and a great crop harvested?

A. That is possible. You can sow it as late as the middle of July, and if you choose you can harvest a crop in the fall. I am not prepared to say that that would work a great injury to the crop. Three or four years ago I had six acres of alfalfa, I marked off three two-acre plots. On one I pastured sheep, not very many but just enough to keep it down a bit. From the second I cut a crop in the fall, and the other two acres I did not touch. The next year so far as appearances went one could not tell which was which. That is the only experiment in that line I have carried on, but it seemed to indicate that on some occasions at least, cutting the crop and harvesting it was not injurious. But I will say that generally speaking farmers and experts in the growing of alfalfa consider that it is not advisable to harvest the crop the first year. They deem it advisable to cut it in September, or a couple of months after seeding and let it lie on the field permitting the new alfalfa to grow up through it. In that way it forms a mulch that protects the roots of the young plants in winter.

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. In the experiment you speak of when did you sow?

A. We sowed it at the time of seeding our grain in the spring. It had been started with a nurse crop. I might say that we cut about a ton of hay to the acre in September.

By Mr. Smith (Stormont):

Q. I understand the object of your mixing was to inoculate the soil?

A. I did not say that inoculation was the sole object of all our mixing, but that it is a method of inoculating the soil. The other object of our mixing is to improve the quality of our pasture. I might say further that we add small amounts of alfalfa seed to almost all our grass mixtures with a view to improving the hay crop and find that it is advantageous.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. Using alfalfa for feeding in the stable is advantageous?

A. Yes, quite.

Q. In that way you can take off four crops in a year?

A. Yes, by starting to feed very early in the season.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. When the soil becomes once inoculated does it always remain in that state?

A. If you discontinued the growing of alfalfa for a long period of time I am not sure that the soil would remain inoculated. But if you ceased to grow it for two

APPENDIX No. 1

or three years and then sow the seed again, the soil would be found to be still inoculated.

Q. Does an adjacent field become inoculated also?

A. Yes, very likely the whole adjacent area would shortly become inoculated. A little flurry of dust flies over the neighbouring field and the soil becomes inoculated in that way.

By Mr. Chisholm (Huron):—

Q. What would you say in regard to using white clover in the west?

A. I am unable to speak as to that.

Q. Because that clover grows very freely around Prince Albert, where it has been brought in, I suppose from the east.

A. Do you mean what is called Dutch clover.

Q. I mean the common white clover.

A. The low lying stuff.

Q. It is of great benefit for pasture purposes on the prairie. Do you know anything about it?

A. We grow it at Indian Head, I am not sure about the other farms. I may say that in my work as Agriculturist I have not had much to do with the Branch Experimental Farms until lately, when I was appointed Supervisor of Experimental Farms, or Dominion Agriculturist.

Q. Will you please keep that subject in mind?

A. Yes. I noticed the clover you speak of at Indian Head last fall.

Q. At Prince Albert it is quite common.

A. I saw it on the streets of Prince Albert last fall.

Q. It seems to me that if inoculation was employed and that clover conveyed in some way to the ordinary pastures on the prairies it would be a great benefit to the growers.

A. It certainly would, we need the legumes out there, and we are gradually getting them, I am glad to say.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. There is one question which I would like to return to. You gave a standard of prices for the average farmer in the early part of your address, and you also gave us a list of the amounts per acre that you produced last year, thus furnishing a standard which you said helped you in arriving at the values per acre of farm lands?

A. Yes, that was the standard.

Q. You spoke of \$2 per ton for corn?

A. Yes.

Q. I thought you had another standard also?

A. You are alluding to my earlier remarks when I compared our crops to the crops in Canada, and I used prices given in the 'Census and Statistics Monthly.' When comparing our own crops I use our own standard prices.

Q. But I am referring to the list you gave us this morning.

A. What I gave this morning is our own standard.

Q. I understand that the cost per acre for ploughing is \$1.06.

A. That is the average cost over the whole farm last year. The actual cost per acre ploughed is about \$1.50.

Q. \$1.06 is an extremely low figure.

A. It can only be an average. We had 173 acres under crop, of which area only about 125 acres was ploughed. Now, suppose the cost of ploughing was \$1.50 per acre, that would be \$185. Divide that by 173 and you get the average cost of the ploughing of the cultivated land about \$1.06 per acre.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

Q. I quite understand, but still the figures would be rather deceptive going out in that way to the farmer. You get the actual ploughing done for a low rate.

A. As a matter of fact we cannot plough an acre of land for that sum, but that is what it costs us on the average. All figures given as to cost of operations are averages, and as such are absolutely correct.

By Mr. Best:

Q. You say that your profits were \$4 per ton in the case of straw?

A. Not profits, but that the straw was worth that sum per ton, in our estimates, we reckoned it at that.

Q. Is that not deceiving to the farmers?

A. No, straw is worth all of \$4 to the average farmer in Eastern Canada.

Q. Is the giving of such averages not misleading?

A. It probably appears a little mixed to a man just listening to the statement, but if you will take the trouble to read the information you will see what is meant. In comparing the values of our crops with the average Canadian crop, we use the same prices in calculating our returns as are used in the case of returns from Ontario. In comparing one year's crop with another as grown on the Central Experimental Farm we use our own prices fixed upon twelve years ago, viz.: Hay, \$7 per ton; straw, \$4 per ton; grain, 1 cent per pound; roots, ensilage and green feed, \$2 per ton.

SUITABILITY AND THOROUGHNESS OF CULTURAL OPERATIONS.

To sum up what I have said about suitability, thoroughness and so on. The farmer must get into his soil an abundance of plant food, must make it available and must get warmth and moisture.

You may get all these things by the proper cultural methods and the following of the proper rotations. I do not hesitate to say that in Eastern Canada at least by following proper rotations and performing the necessary operations at the right time, we need never suffer from drought except on very open gravelly soil.

THE QUALITY AND VARIETY OF SEED.

I need not dwell upon the quality of the seed, because you know the importance of that.

As has been amply demonstrated times without number, the kind of seed sown has no small effect upon the crop returns from a given area.

In the first place good, plump, well matured seed should be used. Such seed gives better returns per bushel sown, produces a more even stand of grain that ripens more uniformly.

The variety to sow will depend upon the locality and no farmer should be content with this variety until he is sure it is the best for his conditions. It should be the best both as to quantity produced and quality of grain harvested.

Then the peculiar fitness of a variety as a disease resistant sort is important. This, however, opens up such a large and unsettled question somewhat out of my domain, that I had better say no more on the subject.

HARVESTING METHODS.

Many farmers sustain great losses through faulty harvesting methods.

Hay is frequently cut much too late in the season. A somewhat greater weight is harvested on this account, but always of inferior quality both as to palatability and nutritive value. Often it is improperly cured before housing; this, too, is a source of loss.

Alfalfa should be cut just as it begins to blossom; red clover when in full bloom, and alsike at about the same stage. Timothy, orchard grass, blue grass, brome grass

APPENDIX No. 1

and most other grasses should be cut inside of a week after blossoming. Hay cut at this stage is somewhat harder to cure, but is worth very much more per acre and per ton than when allowed to stand till ripe or nearly so, as is too frequently the practice of our eastern farmers.

Grain also should be cut when on the fresh side, it should if possible be threshed when being drawn in. Such methods are of course the rule in the west, but in the east much loss is incurred every year by housing grain and threshing later on in the season.

Corn for silage is usually allowed to stand as long as possible. It should of course be in the dough or early glazing stage when cut. The forage is then worth much more than if cut earlier.

Roots are usually harvested in an expensive way. A study of methods of handling roots at harvest time would well repay any farmer.

COST OF CULTURAL OPERATIONS.

The cost of cultural operations is a thing I want to dwell upon. This is a factor, which, taking Canada as a whole, is most productive of high cost or crops. In the first place our farmers do not seem to believe in the economy of good cultivation. Now, good cultivation as I have already stated, is the most important factor imaginable in lowering the cost of production. Fifty cents or a dollar's worth of extra work on an acre is very sure to lower the cost of the return per bushel or ton. Or, in other words, 50 cents extra worth of labour might easily mean five dollars extra worth of crop. That is my own opinion, based on experience and close observation during the last twelve years.

By Mr. Douglas:

Q. That is up to a certain point?

A. Up to a certain point and I have never yet seen that point passed.

By Mr. Best:

Q. But it can be passed?

A. I suppose so. A man might keep on working a field forever, but there are not very many of our farmers likely to do that.

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. There would be a great difference though if a farmer continued each year to cultivate properly. He would after a time reach the desired point more quickly in a given year than a man who did not do that?

A. Undoubtedly, because performing the cultural operations thoroughly each time means less labour to get the land in proper tilth on each successive occasion until you attain to the easiest conditions imaginable.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. On very light soil there would be difficulty in over cultivation?

A. Yes, there is some danger there.

Q. You spoke a moment ago with reference to spring ploughing?

A. For a crop of corn.

Q. That would be all right on light soil, but would you advise it on a clay soil?

A. We have about twenty acres of very heavy clay soil at the Central Experimental Farm and we have tried spring ploughing on that soil without noticing any great difference.

Q. Did you find that with spring ploughing?

A. We found it equally as good as fall ploughing, ploughing shallow of course.

WISE ECONOMY OF TIME AND LABOUR.

Now as to the importance of making the best use of time and labour. Many of our farmers have small irregular fields. But in order to reduce the cost of cultivation an absolutely necessary arrangement is to get good large regular fields. Then, we must increase the power, get heavier horses and more of them. The idea of one man, and in some parts of Canada, two men, going around with one horse is ludicrous and it is the best possible method of doubling the cost of production per ton or per acre. What gives the best results in my own experience is the use of four horses or six horses with one man. Then the cost of the operation performed is cut in two or better. Just to illustrate.

Last year I took a machine, a common disc harrow, on which we used two horses, to get one-third of a certain piece of land in shape for cropping. To prepare this it cost 90 cents per acre. With a heavier disc that took three horses, on another third of the field, it cost me 80 cents per acre. And then I took a double cutaway disc that required four horses and got as good a job done for 45 cents per acre. I cut it down to 45 cents actually in half, by putting on greater power and using the right machine.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. Did you calculate anything on the additional horses?

A. Oh, yes, calculated for everything.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. Did you charge for the feed for the horses?

A. Everything.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. Suppose you had used twice as many horses, could you not have done it for nothing. I think that is the logical result of your argument?

A. Just following that up logically or mathematically, if you use twice as much power that would reduce the cost to 22½ cents per acre, and twice as much again to 11½ cents per acre. I do not know where to stop, but this would probably be approximately true up to a certain point. My point is that if we use greater power we certainly can reduce the cost to a much greater degree even than I have mentioned. Then, as to the cost of ploughing. We ploughed last year with a single plough and it cost us \$2 to plough an acre. With a two-furrow gang plough it cost \$1.25.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. With as good results? Many farmers are prejudiced against the gang plough?

A. That is a great mistake. I can take a gang plough myself and do just as good work as the average man with the walking plough, and I have seen men who could do work with the gang plough and you could not tell it from the walking plough work.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Don't you find that where you are on somewhat gravelly soil and you have two shears, one of them strikes a stone and knocks both furrows out. You disturb two furrows.

A. That is right, get rid of the stones.

Q. It is not properly turned over generally?

A. If you meet with accidents like that there is a double danger. But on the prairies we have no stones and we should not have many stones on our arable land in Ontario, because we have been on it long enough.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. I saw a few taken out a year or two ago at the Experimental Farm?

APPENDIX No. 1

A. We are taking them out every year. We have been taking out stones for the last twenty-five years, and we took out last year, I suppose, 150 tons. You have to keep working them out.

Q. There are a great many in Ontario

A. Stones give trouble, I must admit. Still they do not constitute an insurmountable obstacle to the line of improvement I have suggested. In the west traction engines and gang ploughs are being used. We have one bought for the Central Experimental Farm here at Ottawa, and I propose to see what we can do in that way to lower the cost of cultural operations by dragging five or six ploughs at a time and possibly a disk harrow behind them.

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. In computing what that would cost, what do you allow for the keep of a horse per year?

A. It costs 45 cents per day. We charge 60 cents a day for horse labour, and all figures as to cost of cultural and other operations are figured at that rate, 60 cents per day.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Does that cover shoeing?

A. Everything.

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. That would be \$150 a year?

A. No, about \$180 a year, we allow 60 cents a day, but it really costs us only 45 cents. It varies a little.

By Mr. Smith (Stormont):

Q. I suppose on the ordinary farm the difficulty would be this, while you would pay that for the few days you are busy, what would you do with the horses for the rest of the year?

A. You can employ them profitably until the last days of the fall on the land for one operation or another. In winter you can employ them in hauling out your manure and, of course, there is always more or less trucking about to do. There will be a certain loss, however, to the average farmer. In our case there is no loss.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. You don't use more but less man-power?

A. That is the point. We use greater power and less directing intelligence. Therein lies the advantage, and I believe that the more improvement we can make at that end the better will be our results. Wherever we have tried it we have been more than satisfied with results. Our seeding used to cost 30 cents an acre. Last year and for three years it has cost us only 15 cents per acre, because we did 20 acres a day instead of 10 as we used to do with the small seeder. We use larger harrows, larger ploughs, larger binders. Every machine is the biggest we can get in this part of Canada, and the result has been to lower the cost of our cultural operations by between 30 and 40 per cent. Now, I think that is a point well worth the attention of every farmer in Canada. In my estimate of the cost of growing crops I said that it would take \$9.60 per acre. That is an average, taking it in the west and in the east. If we had been able to figure as conditions are in the west we could have reduced that by \$3, but we had to consider the east. I could show you places in the east, and not far away, where it is not \$9 or \$10, but \$15 or \$16 per acre it costs just because they are using single horse machines, ten-row seeders, four foot mowers, &c.

APPENDIX No. 1

In drilling up our land even we do not drill up one row at once. We do three rows at a time. Everything is done with as large machines as possible. Increase the power, increase the size of the implements, and decrease the cost of directing. The cost of directing power or men's wages is, as you know, the chief item of expense in most operations.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. Do you think that would pay on a hundred-acre farm?

A. Yes, it would pay on any farm over 50 acres. I would not, of course, advise any farmer to throw away his small machines before worn out or nearly so. But when he throws them away as no longer useful he should try to get larger or more effective machines; that is, do something to lower cost of production in this way. When he goes to buy a seeder, he should buy a big one. It might be that his farm was divided into small fields. Small fields are expensive; get the fields as large as possible and then use large machines.

Q. Take a farm of 50 acres that was in two or three fields?

A. On such a farm large machines would be the proper thing. There is nothing better than a four-year rotation on a fifty-acre farm. The smaller the farm, the shorter the rotation.

By Mr. Smith (Stormont):

Q. I know a farmer who followed your idea and he claimed with great advantage.

A. Undoubtedly if we could just gradually eliminate all the small machines found in the east it would be a great thing. I am glad to say there are none in the west; they are all 'wise' there, if I may use that expression. They have there four and six-horse machines, and as a consequence they do their work very much more cheaply than we do, even though the wages are higher in the west.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Do you not often find that in many places where the ground is very irregular these large machines do not work well; that is, when they are getting on very uneven ground?

A. There is a little danger of that, especially in the case of binders some little difficulty is experienced in that connection, and in the use of the large disc harrows.

Q. And the seeders?

A. Yes, in the case of seeders too, there is sometimes some slight difficulty. Remember I said that probably for small farms a sixteen marker seeder would be large enough, but for our work, I feel that we must have a twenty marker to give good results.

COST OF PRODUCING THE CROP UNIT.

An hon. member asked me about the cost of putting these crops in the barn. I have here a statement giving the result of our operations for last year. Our hay cost us, the cheapest hay we made—this I might say pays for the seed and for all labour in connection with it, \$3 for rent, and \$3 for manure per acre—was \$2.75 per ton and the dearest hay we made was \$4.80 per ton. As to grain the cheapest oats we grew, we grow oats only on this farm, cost 14 cents a bushel and the dearest oats we grew cost 31 cents a bushel. These different prices are not due to difference in fertility of the soil, but rather the cost of labour, and in one or two cases to some special experiments that we were carrying on in certain fields. The average price of the hay was around \$3 or \$3.15 in the barns and the average price for oats was around 25 cents a bushel.

Q. In making up that average price do you count anything for the straw?

A. No.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. McColl:

Q. Have you any estimate per acre?

A. We know what every acre costs us.

Q. What would be the average cost per acre?

A. This year it was \$12.65.

Q. Is that for grain?

A. No, that is the cost per acre for all crops on our farm, hay included. Is it the cost per acre of growing certain crops you want?

Q. Yes.

A. I cannot give you that to-day for last year; I have that in our reports for different years, but I have not worked it out yet for last year. In fact, it did not occur to me to do it for this committee this year. Details of the cost of producing every unit of crop are given in my report each year. I can give it to you for 1909 if you wish, it is in my report for that year.

Now we put our corn in the silo in 1910 at anywhere from \$1.12 up to \$1.61 per ton. The average cost was a little lower this year than it has usually been, it was about \$1.25, it usually costs us about \$1.40, which is the average for ten years. The reason why it was a little lower this year I think is that we did not have as much trouble with weeds, it was a dry year and hoeing cost less. For roots cost ran from \$1.15 up to \$1.92 a ton in the root house, with an average of about \$1.65. Now our roots this year were a little cheaper, also, although they were not as good a crop as usual, the hoeing was a great deal less because we had in July and August a long dry spell during which neither the roots nor anything else grew, so that we did not have any hoeing, we cultivated only and that cut off a very considerable sum from the cost of our hoeing operations. But on the average it costs us nearly \$2 per ton to put the roots in the cellar, \$1.40 for corn, \$4 a ton for hay and $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent per pound for oats.

Q. To grow a pound of oats?

A. Yes, $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent.*By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):*

Q. If oats were selling at 20 cents?

A. Twelve years ago, when wages were lower we were paying only \$1.25 a day for a man and we were producing oats at 18 and 19 cents, but now wages have gone up and it costs us 25 cents a bushel. The wage factor is a very important one in influencing the cost of production.

By Mr. Todd:

Q. When you speak of humus you claim that the great advantage of humus is is to conserve moisture, do you not?

A. The advantages of humus are first to conserve the moisture, second the opening up of compact soils, third the binding together of loose soils, fourth the supplying of plant food to plants in available form, and fifth the making of that plant food available and the warming up of the soil.

Q. If you have a good supply of humus in the soil would you consider it necessary to do so much tile draining?

A. I would consider it necessary; in loamy soil it might not be necessary to drain with tile provided you have a fair fall and could use ditches. It will however pay; I will say this that I have never seen the soil that could not be improved by draining even if it is on a nice slope.

Q. In the case of a runout farm which might be bought, do you think it is possible through simply growing clover and turning it down to bring that farm back into a fertile state without working it and growing crops? That is by growing clover and

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

turning it in would it make that soil rich in humus after a course of four or five years?

A. You mean by growing clover and leaving it there?

Q. Yes, supposing you had a broken down farm would it not be practicable in this eastern country to restore its fertility by doing that?

A. I cannot say, but would not think it. I would prefer to grow clover and feed it on the farm. If you can get a good crop of clover and turn it under your farm is not really run out, it is ready to produce a crop of grain. The difficulty is to get the clover started. If you could buy a farm reputed to be run down and that farm will produce clover it is not run down. I may say that with regard to getting good crops of clover there are areas in eastern Canada where clover will hardly grow at all, such land is run out.

By Mr. Smith (Stormont):

Q. Supposing you strike a broken down farm which will not produce clover, which is the best way and the cheapest of restoring fertility?

A. Start with a crop of buckwheat, if anything on earth will grow buckwheat will, let it grow until it is in flower, then turn it down with a very shallow furrow, and if it is late in the season work it well all the rest of the year. If it is not very late you might sow something else, or buckwheat again for that matter, and then turn it down again with a little deeper furrow. Next year sow some legume, sow some peas and oats and pasture it off, do not cut it but pasture it off, and after the probabilities are that you will get a catch of clover and probably a very good one too.

There are some very poor soils in Canada as well as some very fertile areas. On our Experimental Farm in Nova Scotia the land as it is cleared from forest is absolutely barren. The land as it comes out from underneath the crop of fir trees seems to have lost all the plant food that ever was in it. There is no humus on the surface; it is certainly the worst proposition in the way of run out land that you can imagine. There is practically no humus, there is nothing to build up and you have to start in and make a layer of soil suitable for crop production, rather a slow process it is, too.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. In our part of the country clover was a failure for years and years?

A. What part is that?

Q. In Durham county, 60 miles east of Toronto. But lectures were given through the medium of Farmers' Institutes and the lecturers at the meeting advised the farmers to top dress, even lightly, with barnyard manure. I never knew a failure to get a catch of clover where the land was top dressed.

A. That, of, course, is the proper way to do it.

Q. Even supposing the land receives only a light top dressing?

A. But how would you do that where you have not got the manure? We admit that with the aid of manure you can get a crop of clover started.

Q. With a light dressing you are sure to get a catch of clover, and once you get that you are all right?

A. That is very true, but you must have the manure first.

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. Speaking of heavy clay land will tile drains operate all right?

A. Yes, you will notice rapid operation the first year. The second year it will not be quite so good, the third year it may not be any better than the second, but the fourth year and in succeeding years they will work all right. It takes some little time for the water channels to form as it were.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Hon. Mr. Owens:

Q. In clay lands you have the best results?

A. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I am sure, gentlemen, we have listened with a great deal of pleasure and profit to Mr. Grisdale's address, and I hope that it will receive the widest possible distribution.

Committee adjourned.

Certified correct,

J. H. GRISDALE.

RAVAGES OF BLACKHEAD IN TURKEYS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
COMMITTEE ROOM, No. 34,
WEDNESDAY, February 8, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Schell, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN.—As you will notice from the Order Paper, we are to have an address this morning from Mr. A. G. Gilbert, Poultry Manager, Central Experimental Farm, on 'Some instances of the far reaching ravages of blackhead in turkeys.'

Now, poultry raising is generally considered one of the minor branches of agriculture, and yet any of us who have given any attention to the subject know that it is one of the sources from which we derive a large portion of our agricultural wealth. I have not the figures showing what the poultry business represents in Canada at present before me, but it amounts to a good many million dollars. All will admit that the field is very large and one that will repay intelligent cultivation. We are glad to have with us this morning Mr. Gilbert, who is in charge of the poultry department at the Central Experimental Farm. He has not been before us now for three or four years, and I presume will have some new and valuable information to convey on the subject of his address. I have very much pleasure in calling upon Mr. Gilbert to address the committee.

Mr. A. G. GILBERT.—I have much pleasure in coming once again before your committee. A committee which, I am happy to say, has always taken an interest in matters affecting the poultry interests of the country and incidentally the work of my department.

This morning, with your permission, I propose to discuss, and briefly, the far reaching ravages of blackhead in turkeys.

Perhaps at this point I had better explain the nature of the disease—commonly known as blackhead—which has caused such enormous loss to the farmers of the country, and the fatal nature of which has made turkey raising a matter of no little difficulty. It has also been the subject of recent inquiry in parliament.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DISEASE.

One of the best and shortest descriptions of blackhead I have seen is the following:—

'Blackhead is a disease that has destroyed turkeys in every part of the world. Blackhead is caused by germs that have been permitted to gain the ascendancy over the vitality of the fowls. So long as the turkeys were strong and vigorous they were able to contend against this bacterium without being injured by it, but, as the result of careless in-breeding, neglect of stock, filthy surroundings, attempting to grow hogs, sheep, chickens, cows and turkeys on the same piece of ground, the constitution of the turkeys has been weakened to such an extent that they cannot resist the onslaught of the disease. There is no cure for blackhead except to weed out the birds that are attacked by it, bring in new stock, clean up the premises, and create sanitary conditions that will foster the growth of the turkeys.' I now desire to show the wide spread ravages of this disease

THE EXTENDED RAVAGES OF BLACKHEAD IN CANADA.

In reading the following letters received from correspondents in different parts of Canada, I do not wish to play the part of an alarmist, but I think it is for the best that your committee should have a correct idea of the far-reaching ravages this disease of blackhead has made among turkeys in all parts of the country. I will read first a letter from Mrs. Harvey True, of Lincoln, Queens county, N.B., dated September 15, 1910, as follows:—

‘I am writing to see if you can give any information regarding that disease of turkeys called ‘Blackhead.’ I had 47 turkeys, but they have gradually died off, until now I have only 9. They were nearly all full grown. I have tried different things without success.’

She was advised, in reply, to send a live but sick bird to Doctor C. H. Higgins, Bacteriologist, Veterinary Laboratory, which is situated on the Experimental Farm not very far from our poultry building. In a subsequent letter, dated October 22, seven days later, she asks:—

‘How would I send the sick bird, and who will pay the transportation charges? Please let me know, as some of my neighbours have lost their whole flocks. We are anxious that something should be done or we will have to give up turkey raising. Thanking you for the attention given my complaint.’

Letters were also received from W. S. Poole, St. Stephen, N.B.; A. A. Peters, Elmhurst, N.B., and James A. Steves, Salisbury, N.B., all stating that they had lost many turkeys which had died after moping about from diarrhoea and spotted livers. The evacuations were of a yellow colour in the first stage, and previous to death of a greenish tinge. We now go from New Brunswick to Manitoba. Writing on August 3, 1910, from Thornhill, Man., Mrs. James Torey asks for Bulletin 54 on poultry keeping, and states: ‘I have lost *sixty* turkeys this year from blackhead. Please send the best information you can.’

Many instances of loss in Ontario could be given. Perhaps one of the greatest sufferers in the province we heard from was Mr. George Robinson, of London South, and who was very anxious that some measures should be taken to stay the great loss to the farmers by the disease.

Raphael Laplante, of St. Constant, La Prairie county, Quebec, wrote that he hatched 148 turkeys and on October 14, 1910, had only 72 left.

As to an estimate of the loss sustained, I quote from Mrs. Harvey True, of Lincoln, N.B., who says:—

‘I sold 15 turkeys last year which brought me \$50.55. I got 25 cents per pound.’

A good price, but doubtless the birds were fine. I think an average price of 20 cents per pound may be quoted as the prevailing city market price of last winter.

WHAT WE HAVE DONE IN OTTAWA.

On reception of the letters from Mrs. Harvey True and Mr. George Robinson, of London South, I took them to Doctor Charles H. Higgins. Dr. Higgins for some years past has very kindly examined and reported on many cases of diseases of turkeys and fowls; these reports having been officially and according to departmental routine, made to Dr. Rutherford, chief of the division, and who has most courteously forwarded to me copies of them.

A turkey was duly received from Mrs. Harvey True, of Lincoln, N.B., and on examination by Dr. Higgins was found to have blackhead.

APPENDIX No. 1

Five other turkeys were purchased by the department from the affected flock of Mrs. Harvey True, at the suggestion of Dr. Higgins, so that he could experiment with them with the view of, if possible, carrying the afflicted birds over the acute attack and later find a preventive, while he did not expect to find a cure. It is evident to you that if any remedy or treatment can be found to prevent the development of the disease, that something has been gained.

I may say that the turkeys which are being treated by Dr. Higgins and which, it may be remembered, came from Mrs. Harvey True's badly affected flock, did at first shown symptoms of sickness. I am permitted by Dr. Higgins to say that he treated them with a teaspoonful of muriatic acid to a pint of drink water, and up to this time they have shown no outward symptoms of the disease. Dr. Higgins may kill one of these apparently healthy birds in order to find out whether there are internal symptoms of the disease, which being latent might develop at a later period.

This phase of the disease is one of its most mischievous features, for a farmer might purchase a bird apparently sound, to have the disease show itself later on.

By Mr. Best:

Q. Have you any information as to when this disease was first discovered in turkeys in Canada?

A. I appeared before this committee in 1900 and my evidence was more particularly in regard to blackhead than anything else. In 1889, the year previous, I had prepared a report, a copy of which I have here, which also fully treated of the disease. Some of the members of this committee may recollect that a question was asked in the House some weeks ago in regard to this matter, and in reply to the question the Minister of Agriculture stated that a report dealing with the disease had been prepared at the Experimental Farm in the year 1899. But little was known of the disease at that time and the only treatment recommended was bi-chloride of mercury or corrosive sublimate, a small portion in the drink water. Since then very little has been done in Canada, but a great deal has been done in the United States in the way of investigation. Perhaps you will allow me to read from Bulletin 141, issued by the Rhode Island State College, to show the effect of the disease on turkey raising in that state. It gives the results of an investigation by Messrs. Leon. J. Cole and Philip B. Hadley, with the assistance of William F. Kirkpatrick. (Reads):

'Turkey raising was at one time one of Rhode Island's best known industries. Now, however, this industry has almost vanished since, with very few exceptions, the Rhode Island farmer has given up his attempts at turkey raising. The islands of Narragansett bay are turkeyless, while the Block island, which thirty years ago was able to supply the Thanksgiving market with no less than 20 tons of turkeys, not 500 pounds have been shipped annually for many years. The main cause of this deplorable condition is blackhead, which was first noticed in Rhode Island some time previous to 1893, and which has all but annihilated the turkey industry in New England. It has now spread, moreover, with ravaging effects to almost every state of the union.'

From this you can form an idea of the havoc wrought by this disease to the poultry interests of that state. Coming back to Canada, I remember that some years ago two farmers who were among a picnic party from the eastern townships to the Experimental Farm came to my office. One of them said to me: 'I would like to know what the trouble is with my turkeys. We cannot raise them in our district.' In reply to the query as to the nature of the trouble, he replied: 'It seems a sort of cholera and is particularly hard on young birds. My neighbour here has not been able to raise turkeys for two years.' Although we knew very little of the disease at that time it was, doubtless, blackhead that was the trouble. Dr. Theobald Smith, of the Harvard Medical School, who is considered one of the ablest scientific authorities, in 1893 studied the disease and determined that it was caused by an *Amoeba*,

one of the lowest forms of animal life. He named the disease *Amoeba Melgreadis*. This parasite, according to Dr. Salmon, is taken into the digestive organs with the food or drink and attacks the mucous membrane of the cæca and multiplies quickly, causing inflammation. Associated with this is serious disturbance of the liver, which is enlarged in most instances to twice its normal size, and is covered with round discoloured spots. Hence its name 'Spotted Liver.' I have here a coloured illustration. The progress of the disease is more rapid in some cases than others, but death usually follows.

SYMPTOMS OF THE DISEASE.

The symptoms of the disease are as follows:—

First.—Lack of appetite, weakness, emaciation.

Second.—Constant diarrhœa, usually from the first. This diarrhœa is caused by the inflammation of the cæca.

Third.—Half stupor, with an inclination to keep away from the rest of the flock.

Fourth.—In most instances discoloration of the head as the disease advances; hence the name, 'Blackhead, but this is not strictly correct, as the discoloration is not always present.

An alarming feature of the disease is, that is it not until it has got firm hold of the bird that signs of sickness may be observed. It is then too late to save the turkey.

The disease makes great headway in the midsummer months; actively so if the season be damp. I had rather a disagreeable experience in connection with the later development of the disease. A gentleman wrote me from Manitoba that he had bought a turkey cock and two hens, I think he said from some point in Ontario, and that he had scarcely received them when they showed signs of sickness and later died after moping about for some time. I wrote back to say that probably the birds had died from blackhead and possibly they were infected before they were sent him, although showing, then, no sign of disease. He evidently wrote to the man from whom he had bought the birds, and what he wrote I cannot say, but the man who sent the birds wrote to me a very indignant letter saying 'that he was a man of principle and would not sell diseased birds' if he knew it. I replied that I did not mean to reflect on him, owing to the peculiar nature of the ailment that the birds might be affected and not show it.

Young turkeys are most susceptible, although the disease attacks turkeys of all ages. With drooping wings and heads and tottering gait the sick bird, previous to death, presents a truly pitiable appearance.

By Mr. Best:

Q. If these birds were killed immediately after the disease was noticed would it hurt their food properties?

A. That is a moot question. In such cases I give myself the benefit of the doubt. As in many other instances, some authorities say no, while others say yes. Personally I have an objection to running the risk of eating cooked bacteria in any shape or form. As I have already said that despite prolonged investigation by the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, beginning in 1893, and the efforts of Dr. Cole and P. B. Hadley, of the Rhode Island Experiment Station in 1907-9, and in Canada of Dr. C. H. Higgins, bacteriologist of the Veterinary Laboratory of the Health of Animals Division, Department of Agriculture, no cure has yet been discovered for the disease. It is true that we think there has been found some means whereby the disease may be checked or held in abeyance, but nothing has been discovered so far which could be positively stated to be a sure preventive. The five turkeys under the muriatic treatment by Dr. Higgins are being watched with interest.

APPENDIX No. 1

A Canadian investigator, Mr. John Baynes, of the Truro, N.S., Agricultural College, who has evidently given some attention to the disease, writes as follows:—
 'Too much stress cannot possibly be laid upon cleanliness; for by cleanliness only will the disease ever be eliminated from our poultry yards. I have frequently taken infected flocks, killed them off entirely, thoroughly cleaned and disinfected the roosts and houses, picked out fresh lands free from possibilities of infection, started a new stock, and have built up by frequent visiting and inspection and rigid enforcement of sanitary conditions a healthy and remunerative flock of birds. So long as the conditions were maintained the birds remained healthy, but in several cases carelessness or lack of attention to small details of hygiene spelt subsequent disaster.'

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. Just at this point. I think you are perfectly right in devoting your attention to the cause of the disease and trying to find a remedy. Does this disease exist among your birds at the Experiment Farm here?

A. We do not keep turkeys at the Central Experimental Farm, but as I have already stated, there are five turkeys which, it may be remembered, came from Mrs. Harvey True's badly affected flock under experiment by Dr. Higgins, the bacteriologist of the Veterinary Department. These birds were procured by the department for observation and treatment in the interests of the farmers of the country, who are writing so many letters of inquiry to us in relation to this disease.

Q. I was under the impression when you spoke of in-breeding and lack of cleanliness as being among the chief causes of this disease, that such causes could be avoided at the Experimental Farm where you have every opportunity of changing the eggs and preventing in-breeding and of insisting upon cleanliness in your pens.

A. I cannot speak so decisively about turkeys for the reason that we have never had them. I can, however, speak authoritatively on the benefits of cleanliness as applied to other stock. We can, as the honourable gentleman has just said, prevent disease by adopting rigid methods of cleanliness; but in spite of all that this particular disease is so widespread that we have every reason to believe it is not confined to turkeys. In fact, some authorities say it is found in fowls and chickens. Whenever a fowl is attacked with symptoms such as to lead to the suspicion of tuberculosis, blackhead, or, in fact, disease of any kind, we send it to Dr. Higgins, who very kindly examines the bird. It is of the utmost importance, as you will readily see, that any instance of the inroad of this disease into the flocks of domestic poultry at home or throughout the country should be grappled with and if possible checked. I think you will agree with me that great loss is occasioned to our farmers from the death of so many of their turkeys, and I have taken up this particular subject this morning in the hope of not only interesting the committee in this disease, but also with a view of distributing information among the farmers as to preventive measures which might tend to check the disease, although a positive cure cannot be named.

PREVENTIVE MEASURES.

Preventive means are recommended in Bulletin 141 of the Rhode Island Experiment Station, viz.:—

1. Careful inspection of all new stock. The new stock should be purchased where the disease has never made its appearance.

2. The turkeys should be kept if at all possible by themselves. Give them fresh ground every two years.

3. Every bird should be kept under strict observation. A bird showing the slightest sign of sickness should at once be isolated and closely watched.

4. Yards and premises should be kept free as possible from English sparrows, and the poultry house from rats and mice. It has been shown at the Rhode Island Station that these rodents carry the parasite.

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

5. Fatten birds slowly. Heavy feeding does not cause blackhead, but it does frequently cause the sudden death of a bird in which the disease is present.

6. If a bird dies of blackhead it should be promptly burned or buried; better to be burned.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. Why do you not keep turkeys at the Central Experimental Farm?

A. I am not an executive officer. But we really have not room.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. Cannot you recommend that turkeys be kept for the purpose of experiment?

A. I could, but the committee has recommended once or twice; once, I think, at the instance of the honourable member for Peel, that turkeys be kept on the Farm, but I cannot see how such can successfully be done until we have more ground. We have two acres devoted to poultry at the Central Experimental Farm. At one time the committee recommended that the area of our ground be increased to 25 acres. However, it has not been found convenient to carry out that recommendation.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. Would not two acres be a large enough area for you?

A. For experimental purposes up to recently this area has been found very useful, but we have found that if the ground becomes poisoned it is a matter of very great difficulty, if not an impossibility, to raise chickens satisfactorily. The present two acres would be invaluable to a bacteriologist for experimental purposes as it has been in use for many years.

Q. But for your purposes at the present time, how much land do you think you ought to have?

A. I should like to have a complete change of ground and much larger area.

Q. How much land do you think you would require?

A. It would depend altogether upon the scope of the experimental work undertaken. When we established the poultry division on the Experimental Farm in 1887, we were considered ahead of all the poultry departments on the continent, but Cornell University has in recent years established a poultry department of eighty acres extent; in fact, the managing authorities bought a small adjoining farm which is devoted to poultry. The poultry department is in charge of Professor James E. Rice, who has five assistants, two of whom are bacteriologists. They are now going extensively into poultry experimental work in all its different branches.

By Mr. Lennox:

Q. You have two acres at the Central Experimental Farm devoted to poultry, and I understand you to say the ground has probably become poisoned. Now, if that is the case, is it not absolutely necessary that there should be a change of pasture?

A. Yes; we have that to a certain extent.

Q. That the fowls should be removed to some land that is not poisoned?

A. Yes, that is strictly correct, but a certain portion of our two acres has been ploughed up and to a certain extent we have to curtail our experimental work. You will readily understand the necessity for our doing so.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. If you had four acres instead of two acres would you be better off?

A. Certainly, that would give us twice as much land.

By Mr. Lennox:

Q. If the poisoned land were ploughed up and left for a time wouldn't it become all right in due course?

APPENDIX No. 1

A. Yes, if it were sown with grass as a part of it has been, the chickens would be immune from contamination; but in course of time—if succeeding generations of chickens ran over the land—it will once more become contaminated. I think the better way would be to let the ground remain unused for a certain time and resort to new land, and finally come back to the former ground.

Q. Exactly?

A. But of course if we had turkeys, geese and ducks we would have to have a very much more extended field of operation, because it would never do to have the different breeds of poultry brought up together. You can imagine, in such a case, the mischievous results that would follow the breaking out of blackhead in the turkeys.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. The turkey is naturally a wanderer and requires a great deal of ground?

A. Yes. It is a forager. It is difficult to keep turkeys within small limits. Geese are also foragers.

By Mr. Lennox:

Q. But they do not require so wide a range?

A. No, not quite.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. But it is possible to raise turkeys and geese in small numbers?

A. Yes, but in limited numbers where there is limited range.

RECOMMENDED REMEDIES.

By the Chairman:

Q. In brief, Mr. Gilbert, in order to prevent blackhead would you advise some form of treatment?

A. Yes; I have a form of treatment in my notes. I thought it best to first mention what might be found preventive measures. With your permission I will mention some of the recommended remedies. There is nothing surely guaranteed. I cannot state anything for a certainty, nor can I find any authority who can. Nevertheless it is my duty, and I am sure your pleasure, that I should lay before the farmers of the country such information as I have collected from the best authorities on the disease and which is calculated to help them.

As before remarked, advanced cases of blackhead are considered incurable, and it is only waste of time and effort to attempt to cure a badly affected bird. In mildly affected cases Mr. John Baynes, of the Agricultural College, Truro, N.S., writes that he has used in Africa and Australia the following remedies with marked success:—

1. Sulphur, 5 grains; sulphate of iron, 1 grain, and sulphate of quinine, 3 grains.
2. Sulphate of iron, $\frac{1}{2}$ grain; salicylate of soda, 3 grains.
3. Beuso-naphthol, 1 grain; salicylate of soda, 1 grain.

In each case a dose should be administered at night, or, in acute cases, night and morning. As I have said, these are not given as certain cures, but they may help to combat the disease in mild cases. I have already mentioned that Dr. Higgins has used a teaspoonful of muriatic acid to a pint of drink water, with good results so far. Now, if the use of this acid is found to be a check to the development of such a grave disease, surely great good will have been accomplished.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Is the acid tried as a preventive?

A. I answer in the words of Dr. Higgins: 'The acid is used with the object of carrying the affected birds over the acute attack and later to find a preventive.' No remedy has yet been found that can be stated as a sure cure.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. Do you administer that treatment to a bird that has not been affected?

A. It could be used to good effect in that way. I speak more directly in mildly affected cases.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. You say that a badly infected case is incurable?

A. Yes.

Q. Would it not be advisable to adopt preventive measures all over the country in order to try and prevent the spread of the disease?

A. Certainly, that is one of my objects in appearing before you this morning and giving you this short resumé. I would like all the information we have to reach the farmers in the shape of my evidence which I am now giving before your committee.

Q. Is it the intention to administer this remedy to perfectly healthy flocks of birds so as to prevent their contracting this disease?

A. Such could certainly be done, but, as I have already noted, other preventative measures are cleanliness, the avoidance of inbreeding, thorough disinfection, &c. The disease has never been scientifically investigated in Canada, and the information I am giving to the committee this morning is what I have gleaned from the best authorities extant and the result of Dr. Higgins' efforts carried on until very recently in an informal sort of way. I do sincerely hope that scientific authorities in Canada will take the matter up in a more extended way; meanwhile we should be guided by what the most reliable investigators have so far found as likely to be preventives and many of which I have mentioned. A drawback is that when first symptoms have shown themselves they are not noticed, and frequently when noticed it is too late to adopt remedial measures. Furthermore, little is known by the farmers of the country as to the deadly nature of the disease. Farmers frequently write to the effect: 'My turkeys have the cholera. What is the trouble with them?' Now, the farmers have to learn the first symptoms of the disease, and then to realize that is the proper time to adopt remedial measures. I am afraid it is a hard matter to get the farmers to attempt treatment when first symptoms are noticed because it necessitates some little trouble.

By Mr. Lennox:

Q. You told us that in a severe case no cure is possible; nothing can be done?

A. No, not in advanced cases.

Q. What about a mild case?

A. Then there is some hope.

Q. There are some remedies which will check the disease? But you say that even in a mild case the remedies will not cure, but only check it?

A. So far no certain cure has been found, but if we can check the disease it will be a great achievement.

Q. Have I not stated the position of matter correctly?

A. Yes, certainly.

Q. That is that in a mild case you simply check the disease; you do not eliminate it?—A. Just so. Really, even that has never been proven.

Q. That is what I would like to know?

A. And I would very much like to be able to answer you positively. As I have said, there are five turkeys now in the hands of Dr. Higgins, which, when brought to his laboratory, were apparently affected with the disease. He is going to kill one in order to discover whether the treatment has had any effect in the case of that bird or whether a turkey is affected with the disease or not.

Q. Is it known that those birds actually had the disease when he began to treat them?

APPENDIX No. 1

A. Dr. Higgins informed me that they did seem sick when he got them. We have no test, such as the tuberculine test as applied to cattle, for finding out as yet whether a turkey is affected with the disease or not.

Q. It seems to me that there is not much object in checking the disease; the most effectual way is to destroy the birds and endeavour to get rid of them?

A. That is what the best authorities say. They recommend that the whole flock should be destroyed and new blood brought in. But investigations, in the way that Dr. Higgins and other investigators are carrying on, with the hope of finding a cure, are surely invaluable.

By Mr. Lennox:

Q. There is another point. Has there been any action taken by the government to inspect turkeys that are for sale in the market? Has there been anything of that kind?

A. I do not think there is any such inspection, but the city has a food inspector in the person of Dr. Hollingsworth who has seized turkeys on several occasions on the market which from their appearance he concluded were not fit to eat. And investigation proved some had blackhead.

Q. Here in Ottawa?

A. Yes.

Q. Is this blackhead a visible disease? Does it manifest itself on a turkey? Has the bird actually a blackhead?

A. Discoloration of the head is one of the symptoms, but it is not always present. The worst feature of the disease is that when emaciation is visible it is too late to save the bird. There are certain symptoms, such as I have described, which to the careful observer should be evident. If a man has a flock of birds which he values he is likely to look to their condition every now and again.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. I suppose it is an established fact that it is contagious?

A. Yes, from the fact that contamination may be taken up in the food or drink. Unless affected ground is thoroughly ploughed up and thoroughly disinfected it is a source of danger.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. If two lots of turkeys are placed in a store for sale, one affected with blackhead and the other not, could the ordinary purchaser detect either?

A. It would be difficult unless the disease had so far advanced that the emaciated condition of the bird is evident. It is one of these subtle diseases which is hard to detect when a bird is first affected.

By Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish):

Q. Would not any disease be evidenced by emaciation?

A. Yes, but in this disease there is usually diarrhoea from the bird.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is there anything to indicate that when a man goes into the market he could say, this bird has that particular disease?

A. I think not, unless symptoms had clearly shown themselves.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Did I understand you to say you had five birds at the Experimental Farm and were feeding them?

A. Dr. Higgins has procured them for experimental purposes.

Q. At the Experimental Farm?

1-41

A. Yes, at his laboratory of the Health of Animals Department on the Experimental Farm.

Q. Are those the first birds purchased for that purpose?

A. Yes.

Q. How long is it since they were purchased?

A. Three or four months.

Q. Are we to understand that this disease has been widespread in the community and that the first effort to experiment at the Experimental Farm has been within the last three months?

A. The first official experiment. I think I might mention that in 1899 I published a report on blackhead and in that report is noted the first case of blackhead detected in Canada.

Q. How long is that ago?

A. In 1899.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Is there any particular breed of turkeys more than another affected by this disease?

A. No, all are affected by it. Young birds are chiefly susceptible.

By Mr. Best:

Q. You simply get these affected birds from the farmers, do you?

A. Yes.

Q. The reason I ask is if we had this disease ten or eleven years ago and it has caused the death of a great many turkeys, has there been no experiment made to try and check this disease in some way?

A. In the United States they found no remedy, and so far as we are concerned in this country it is a comparatively new disease. But no efforts have been made to deal with it until lately.

By Mr. Hunt:

Q. Have you any disease of that kind on the farm?

A. No, we do not keep turkeys, but the letters I have read show how widespread this disease is, and we are every day getting letters in relation to it.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. You tell us one of the chief causes of the trouble was inbreeding?

A. One of them, yes.

Q. Now, it appears to me if you are ever going to eradicate the disease you must start at the bottom. You must get healthy eggs to breed turkeys from. Now, cannot the Experimental Farm do something in the way of getting healthy birds and distributing healthy eggs all over the country? I think something of that kind should be recommended. I do not think it is sufficient to try curing a turkey after it is diseased. It is not worth the doctor's bill. I would rather start afresh and get at something that would practically prevent the disease. As to inbreeding, do you lay as much stress on that as we understand you to do?

A. Yes, inbreeding in turkey raising is certainly followed by disastrous results. The point you brought out as to eggs is an important one. All eggs that are purchased for hatching purposes should be disinfected; should be washed over with a mild solution of some disinfectant as a precautionary measure. I may say that I have only taken up such points, an explanation of which will be of the most service to the farmers. What we want to get the farmers to do is to pay more attention to the condition of their turkeys from time to time. When they notice a bird to be sick they should isolate it, and then at this early stage some of the measures I have named to the committee might be effective.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Lennox:

Q. And while we do not know that there is any selling of infected birds to the public; so far as you have said or could ascertain those birds might never be fit for human food?

A. Unfortunately that is likely to be the case until more is known about the disease and its first symptoms. If I am allowed I would suggest to the chairman and gentlemen of the committee that Dr. Higgins be summoned and he will doubtless be able to give you much information from his standpoint of bacteriologist. My only intention on this occasion is to arouse the attention of the farmers of the country to the serious ravages this disease is making among their turkeys and to ask their co-operation in our attempt to stem it.

By Mr. Best:

Q. It is to be regretted that you have no turkeys in your department at the farm to experiment with. Such information as you are giving now, while very useful and which will doubtless be of service to the farmers of the country, would be much more effective if based on your own practical experience.

A. I appreciate that point. I doubt whether a bacteriologist could have given you more information about the disease than I have done. I have only quoted what our own Dr. Higgins and other leading bacteriologists in the United States have found as to the nature of the disease and certain preventive means and remedies recommended by them. I want to arouse the farmers as to what loss this disease is causing means to them.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Turkey raising is a very profitable business?

A. Yes. I have already mentioned to show this the statement of Mrs. Harvey True, who sold fifteen turkeys for \$50. Owing to my having received so many letters on the subject and the question having been brought up in parliament, it was suggested to me that it would be as well to bring the matter before this committee. I have done so, and have enumerated preventive methods and explained what Dr. Higgins has found to be a means of prevention. Now, if his discovery turns out to be a really preventive measure, it will be of considerable value. You must remember that the United States Bureau of Agriculture and the State of Rhode Island have had investigators inquiring into this disease for the past nine or ten years, and that they have so far reached no positive treatment that will cure except, perhaps, as to the best preventive measures among them—cleanliness—and what Mr. Henderson has so timely mentioned—the refraining from in-breeding.

By Mr. Lennox:

Q. Your department, Mr. Gilbert, is called the poultry department?

A. The poultry division at the Central Experimental Farm.

Q. Are you the head of that?

A. Yes.

Q. Are we right in understanding that the only poultry you have under your care and management are hens?

A. Yes, hens.

Q. If we were rounding out your poultry division and making it up to date we should place under your management hens and turkeys, geese and ducks?

A. Yes.

Q. And in order to have a complete and properly rounded out poultry division it would be necessary to have a great deal more land, would it not?

A. Yes.

Q. Probably a hundred acres in all?

A. I would not say so much as that.

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Q. What area would you say?

A. I think 20 or 25 acres.

Q. That would be sufficient for all experimental purposes and permit the incorporation of all branches of poultry?

A. Yes, to have it thoroughly representative. We have some land peculiarly adapted for poultry raising.

Q. What I have suggested would be advisable, would it not?

A. I certainly have no objections to such arrangements.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Are we to understand that you have no geese or ducks at the Central Farm?

A. We have only hens.

By Mr. Best:

Q. Did you ever have geese or ducks or turkeys?

A. No.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure we all appreciate very much the valuable information imparted to the committee by Mr. Gilbert.

The committee adjourned.

Certified correct.

A. G. GILBERT.

THE PRODUCTION OF EGGS IN WINTER

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

COMMITTEE ROOM No. 34,

WEDNESDAY, February 22, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock, a.m., Mr. Schell, the Chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN.—As you know Mr. Gilbert appeared before us a short time ago and only a portion of the subjects announced were dealt with. We therefore thought it wise to have him return and continue his remarks on the topics of which notice has been given; viz.—“The Increasing Demand for Strictly New Laid Eggs;” “The Farmer’s Great Opportunity to Supply the Same” and “The Best Methods for him to Adopt in Procuring Eggs in Winter.” We are all pleased to have Mr. Gilbert with us again, to address us on this subject.

Mr. A. G. GILBERT.—I have great pleasure in appearing before you again in response to your summons, and I will ask your kind attention for a short period, while I address you on the subjects which the Chairman has announced.

THE INCREASING DEMAND FOR STRICTLY NEW LAID EGGS.

My first point is the increasing demand for strictly new laid eggs.

There is a rapidly growing demand for strictly new-laid eggs with the delicious flavour which they ought to and will have if laid by well, cleanly, and properly fed hens, and placed in the hands of the consumer as soon after they are laid as possible, and the sooner the better. A new laid egg is not only toothsome, but it is highly nourishing. Indeed, in cases of incipient consumption new laid eggs are prescribed as a specific. The new laid egg then should be (a) Well-flavoured, (b) Extremely nourishing, (c) Placed in the hands of the consumer soon after being laid, (d) Be clean and inviting in appearance.

Good flavour depends upon the feeding of pure, wholesome and varied rations—such as I will describe later on—and the eggs should be laid in absolutely clean nests. The hen that is allowed to eat decaying animal and vegetable substances or drink leachings from a manure heap—as many are allowed to do—is not likely to lay an egg with as fine a flavour as one that is fed with care and cleanliness. Nor will an egg fed on filthy substances keep as well. Corn or corn-meal, as part of a ration, tends to good flavour and better keeping, and what is of great import, the egg should be non-fertilized, especially so in the summer season.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington).

Q. Will the hens lay as well if they get that kind of treatment?

A. Yes, we found out some time ago by experiment that hens will lay equally as well without the male bird. To have a nutritious egg the hen which laid it must not only be well nourished by proper and generous feeding, but she must be kept absolutely free from lice. It will be plainly evident that if lice are permitted to suck the life-blood of a hen, that she will not lay an egg as full of nourishment as she would do if in robust condition. I repeat; that if lice are permitted to get first

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

chance at the blood (the nutriment) of the hen, that there will be precious little nourishment in the eggs laid by her. This is a most important point and one on which very little importance is placed I am afraid, by farmers, for I get many letters to this effect,—‘My hens were laying fairly well; after a while they began to lay fewer eggs; became thin and weak looking, with pale combs, and some go staggering about. Can you tell me what ails them?’ And I certainly have no hesitation in stating that lice is the trouble, and I advise them to use fresh lice destroying powder—such as pyrethrum—upon the hens, and to spray the poultry-house with an eight or ten per cent solution of carbolic acid, mixed in hot water, so as to permit of the acid readily assimilating with the water, or one of the well known sheep dips, and to be sure that, afterwards, the hens as well as the house are free from lice. Nothing is more effectual in the keeping of the poultry-house and the fowls free from lice than fine and dry coal or wood-ashes. Give the fowls dust baths of the ashes and scatter some about the poultry-house. A great deal of dust may result but the lice cannot live in dust.

By the Chairman:

Q. That is so simple, you would give us to understand it is really very effective?

A. It is. I have had many letters from farmers stating that they have found it so.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Would you state that over again?

A. Nothing is more effectual in keeping the poultry-house and the fowls free from lice than fine and dry coal or wood ashes. Give the fowls dust baths of the ashes and scatter some about the poultry-house. A great deal of dust may result, but lice cannot live in dust. Lice have no nostrils. They breathe through the pores of the skin, and the fine dust by adhering to the skin chokes the lice. Hence, the reason why the hen, when at large, takes to the fine road dust in preference to any other kind.

The CHAIRMAN.—The subject you are dealing with is so important that I was anxious to have it emphasized in the report. I believe lice are the greatest detriment that the poultry-men have to contend against in the production of eggs, and if such a simple remedy will dispose of the lice everybody who has poultry ought to know it.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Do you mean dust as well as ashes?

A. Either.

Q. I am very much afraid it is not an infallible remedy?

A. I have tried it with the most marked success. It simply means that if the fine dust gets at a louse he is done for.

The CHAIRMAN.—In the summer months hens will invariably go to dry earth and dust themselves, and it seems to me that what the witness is saying only confirms what we have seen in our every-day observation, that hens will go and dust themselves in fine earth or anything of that nature; and I presume the object is to keep themselves free from vermin.

Mr. SPROULE.—We have kept hens for twenty-five years, and every year we put quantities of ashes around the hen-houses, and yet we find lots of lice on the hens. It does not seem to me to be an infallible remedy.

Mr. GILBERT.—I know that in some cases, especially where red mites have got possession of the hen-house, it is very difficult to get rid of them; so difficult that if a man writes me to say that his poultry-house is infested with red mites, I write and tell him, ‘You have got the work of your lifetime cut out.’ It is a hard matter to get rid of red mites, for they hide away during the day and come out in the night time,

APPENDIX No. 1

in countless thousands, and suck the blood from the hens. They also multiply very quickly. It is said that red mites have great grandchildren in forty-eight hours. Now this, as the Chairman has said, is a most important point, because many farmers write to me complaining that their hen-houses are infested with what are, doubtless, red mites. In the case of red mites, it is best to begin by spraying the poultry-house carefully with a solution of from eight to ten per cent of carbolic acid, mixed as I have explained. Do this while the hens are out of the house early in the morning, so that the dangerous effects of the solution may be nullified by night when the hens go to roost, afterwards apply the dust or whitewash, and I think there will be very little future difficulty. And I think if the poultry-house was whitewashed occasionally it would be an advantage anyway.

Mr. BEST.—My experience has been something like Dr. Sproule's, but by adding some finely ground sulphur to the dust we found that it destroyed the lice altogether.

Mr. GILBERT.—Yes, there is not the slightest doubt that the sulphur would help. The trouble is that most persons, who keep poultry, will not adopt a remedy until their poultry houses are in complete possession of lice. Once a house is thoroughly infested, it is a very hard matter to get rid of these pests, particularly the red mites. But it can be done with energy and perseverance.

With your permission I now take up my next point, viz.:—The increasing demand for strictly new laid eggs. This rapidly increasing demand is one of the most striking instances of poultry development in recent years. The call is both urgent and rapidly increasing.

I speak now more particularly of the home market, and I will read the following official figures to verify my statement that the demand of the home market has rapidly increased in recent years. In 1902 we exported 11,635,108 dozen eggs to the value of \$1,733,242. In 1909, seven years later, the shipments had decreased from 11 millions to 552,850 dozens, of the value of \$124,315. In 1910 we exported only 160,650 dozens, having a value of \$41,766.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. To what country were those eggs exported?

A. To Great Britain principally.

Q. And the exportation is continually falling off every year?

A. Yes, as I have just shown.

Q. Is that largely because of the increased consumption at home?

A. Yes, showing the increased value of the home market.

Q. And we have not got the eggs to ship abroad; is that the meaning of it?

A. So far from having eggs to ship we have actually been importing them.

Q. So I have heard.

A. And some of these exports have not been very successful.

By Mr. Arthurs:

Q. Do we produce more or less eggs than formerly?

A. We undoubtedly produce more. Perhaps you will permit me to explain, as I do at Farmer's Institute meetings, that the position of the egg and poultry situation in Canada is actually unique and in this way: that we have reduced exports; increased home production and, notwithstanding, increased prices.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. And you are increasing also your import of eggs?

A. Yes.

Q. Year by year?

A. Yes, more so in the past two years. That is one of the most striking features of the situation. If you were to go to a business man and say to him:—'We have not only decreased exports but increased production,' I think he would be likely to

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

say 'You must have a mighty cheap home market.' But instead of that the value of the home market has steadily increased, so that prices, for strictly new laid eggs and the better quality of poultry were never higher than they have been this winter. All this goes to show the rapidly increasing value of the home market.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. You have laid considerable stress on the desirability of new laid eggs and eggs produced under circumstances favourable for improving the quality. Now, does it come within your province to compare the qualities of eggs?

A. We sometimes do that. I have some eggs from one poultry department with me to show their superior quality and how neatly put up.

Q. Have you compared any of the imported Russian and Chinese eggs with the eggs produced in Canada under good conditions; and if so, can you state the comparative results?

A. No; I have made no such comparison.

Q. Would it not be a good thing to do?

A. It would. I may be permitted to say that a merchant friend had some experience in this respect.

Q. And what was the result of that experience or comparison?

A. I may say that it was rather an unfortunate one, for the Health Officer of Montreal condemned the whole importation he had made as unfit for human food. I am speaking now more particularly of the eggs imported from Russia and China.

Q. Do you know what became of those condemned eggs? Were they sent out of the country or were they allowed to circulate through Canada and go into consumption?

A. I do not know anything beyond what I have read in the newspapers and the information which I have received from my friend. I have some strictly new laid eggs with me from one poultry division of the farm, and I will point out their points of superiority in a few minutes.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Were the eggs that you refer to imported in the shell?

A. Some were, and others were broken and in cans.

Q. Chiefly broken, I think, were they not?

A. Yes, the greater quantity were I believe. I would like to have seen some of these Chinese eggs, for they were said to be quite aged and venerable.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. I do not know whether it is your duty, but it certainly should be some person's duty, to compare the quality of these imported eggs with that of our native eggs, so that our people may not be imposed upon in the importation of eggs of inferior quality, even if sold at a lower price?

A. I quite appreciate your point. It is not exactly within my jurisdiction. I think officials at Montreal and other ports of entry do that, and I sometimes hear results.

Q. I understand that those eggs, although condemned, are percolating into general use, and I do not think they should. As you are the man at the head of the poultry and egg department of the country, I was under the impression that it was your duty to look after that matter?

A. Doubtless it would be most important and interesting work, but permit me to say that I have just about as much work at present as one man can do if I confine myself strictly to my present duties, viz., to attend farmers' meetings, write bulletins and reports, besides attending to a large and rapidly increasing correspondence and the experimental work.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Have you any figures to show the total production of eggs in Canada?

A. Not official figures. But the figures I have just read to you are official. I believe the value of the poultry industry last year in Canada amounted to something like \$48,000,000. This statement was made by Mr. J. A. Gunn, President of the Montreal Produce Exchange, in a recent address by him.

Q. You mean that the investment in the poultry industry in Canada last year amounted to \$48,000,000?

A. I mean that the output of both eggs and poultry in Canada last year was valued at that large amount. As to the United States, it was nearly \$700,000,000.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. I presume the only way to get at the value of the eggs produced in the country is just to estimate. There is no way of getting anything like exact figures?

A. No not yet, neither in Canada nor in the United States. Some of these estimates are carefully prepared. I believe that in our forthcoming census statistics will be collected as to poultry. If you remember the schedules in the last census only included horses, cattle and pigs. In the forthcoming census I believe poultry will be included. Upon a future occasion—when I hope to have the pleasure of again appearing before your Committee—I may be able to give you something more definite than I can just now do in this regard.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. That will be, I suppose, the year following the Census?

A. I hope so.

In proceeding, I beg to state that the urgent and increased demands in the larger cities of Canada for eggs and poultry of superior quality has resulted in high figures being asked and cheerfully paid for the choice and select article. I do not like quoting these prices for—while they are strictly correct—they are to a certain extent exceptional inasmuch as they are paid for an exceptionally choice article, but one that is being more asked for every year, and not only in the winter, but also in the summer season. It should certainly be the aim of the farmer to cater to this high class trade and secure the higher values.

I wish now to show you that some farmers or their wives do cater to this high class trade. I have here a letter from a farmer's wife whose name I need not mention, but if it is necessary I will do so. She writes about a disease that attacked her fowls and in so doing states that they had got up to an average of $2\frac{1}{2}$ dozen eggs a day, until the ailment complained of, reduced the egg yield to one-half to what it was. This she says was quite a blow to her pocket and her pride for 'I got fifty cents a dozen from a Montreal house for my eggs during December and January, but now, as usual, prices are coming down.'

By Mr. Best:

Q. Does she say how many hens she had that produced that number?

A. No. She does not so state in her letter.

Here is a letter from a lady of Cranbrook, British Columbia—written a few days ago—who says: 'Eggs have been 75 cents here all winter (per dozen I mean) except at Christmas, when they were 90 cents per dozen.'

I have also a letter from a gentleman living on Second avenue, Vancouver, B.C., who states: 'Eggs at 50 cents, and 80 in winter cause one to have a high regard for the hen which lays the eggs when prices are at the figures named.'

I could further quote but it is hardly necessary. These are however very respectable prices.

Now, if you will permit me, I will hand to you some card boxes of eggs. The eggs were laid by the hens in our poultry division. Each case holds one dozen eggs.

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

This (passing around box) contains eggs from White Rock pullets, and you will notice that they are remarkably large and fine. This is a case (producing case) of hens' eggs. I want you to note the difference between the hens eggs and the pullets eggs. In this instance the difference is not so great, as it usually is, for the pullets eggs are on the large side, but there is a noticeable difference. These are cases containing eggs from White Wyandotte and White Leghorns. There are some very fine Buff Orpington eggs.

Such prices as fifty cents per dozen were paid by the leading groceries most willingly for such eggs as shown. These grocers have a good class of customers, and sixty cents and even a higher figure per dozen were charged for the same kind of eggs in this city, up to two weeks ago. This is the time of year when prices usually decline and lower values are likely to prevail. One of the partners in a leading grocery firm in this city assured me that he received sixty and sixty-five cents for a dozen of eggs, neatly put up in clean and neat card boxes, such as shown, and the date when they were laid stamped on each egg.

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. Can you give us any idea of the cost of production of those eggs that sell at 50 cents a dozen.

A. Will you permit me to speak roughly?

Q. Yes.

A. Then I will say from 12 to 15 cents a dozen.

Q. It would perhaps be better to say 15 cents, because we feed well, particularly during the winter season.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. In making the calculation of 15 cents, on what proportion of hens laying do you figure?

A. If we get 50 per cent of our hens to lay during the winter season, we consider that we are doing remarkably well.

By Mr. Douglas:

Q. In giving us the figure of 15 cents, are you reckoning that as the price all the year round?

A. No; I refer to part of November and the whole of December, January and February. I desire the farmers to produce eggs in winter and to receive a higher price for them than they do at present. There is too much inclination on the part of the farmer to neglect his hens during the season of high prices, and as a result they do not lay. They do not do so until the weather becomes warm in spring, and then prices go down. Farmers should also put up their eggs in such boxes as these (exhibiting samples). There is on each box, as you see, a special label bearing the printed words 'Strictly new laid eggs' or 'These eggs are absolutely fresh,' so that they are actually guaranteed. And then when a grocer gets these neat packages he puts them on his counter and they are readily purchased. I know of a farmer near Almonte who sent his eggs, put up in such a way, to a grocery in this city. The manager told me that their customers got so satisfied with this brand that they would have none other, but asked, 'Have you got any of the Hillside brand?' You see the value of a good name begotten by putting up a good article in a neat package. The clerk told me that they could not get enough of these packages to sell.

By Mr. McColl:

Q. What do those boxes cost?

A. We get them at a cent a box.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. With the inside sections in?

APPENDIX No. 1

A. Yes, all complete. We pay \$10 for a thousand boxes and \$1 extra for the printing on them.

By Mr. Best:

Q. Is the average cost for production for the summer six months not much less than the other months?

A. Oh, certainly. I am only speaking of the high-priced season. I hope I have not misled the committee in that respect.

Q. What would you calculate to be the cost of production per dozen during the six or seven months of the summer season?

A. That would depend on whether the hens ran outside and picked up a certain amount of their living or were yarded and fed on special rations. But under ordinary farm conditions I think eggs can be produced in summer for, say, from six to eight cents a dozen, perhaps less.

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. The cost of production in those other months would be considerably more than six or eight cents?

A. In the winter months?

Q. Yes?

A. I am putting a pretty high value on the cost of winter egg production, because to supply a select article we usually have to go to more trouble and cost. I have emphasized that in my next point, which I will take up a little later on. To return to the card boxes. I saw a very neat box holding a dozen new laid eggs the other day in a grocery store. On the outside of the card box was printed a guarantee that the eggs were strictly new laid and were laid by well and cleanly fed hens. I was in this store on Saturday, January 21st last, and on opening the box I found the eggs stamped the 20th (the day before) when they were laid. With the date was stamped the name of the poultry-keeper. Is it any wonder that such eggs sold at the highest value? In the same store were cases of eggs that were called 'fresh,' but they only were valued at 30 and 35 cents per dozen. Why? Because the man who sold them could not guarantee that they were new laid. It just amounts to this, that the man with the superior article is in a position to demand the highest price, while a man with the inferior article has to take what he can get.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. What do you call a new-laid egg?

A. One which reaches the consumer within four days after being laid. A guileless purchaser is often imposed upon, but usually for once only. For this guileless purchaser who has paid 35 cents a dozen for the so-called fresh eggs, on finding out afterwards that half are partially hatched, quickly realizes that the eggs have really cost him 70 cents per dozen, and that it would have been cheaper for him to have paid 50 or even 60 cents for a dozen of guaranteed eggs, in the first place. That is a point I like to emphasize when I go to Farmers' Institute meetings.

THE FARMERS' GREAT OPPORTUNITY TO SUPPLY THE STRICTLY NEW-LAID EGGS.

In taking up this point we must bear in mind that it is from the farmers of the country that the great bulk of our egg and poultry supply must come, and that supply is not so likely to come from the few farmers with a great many hens, as it is from the many farmers with a few hens each, say from 50, 75 or 100 each. And it is a matter of congratulation to realize that farmers are in the best position, particularly those whose farms are near to large cities and towns, to supply strictly new-laid eggs, and the superior quality of poultry and so reap the highest prices. Why? Because they are not only within easy reach of a good market but they usually have

grain, roots, and other essentials in abundance, frequently in the shape of waste. At any rate at first cost. The farmer is indeed in a position to out-rival all competitors. I once attended a large gathering of farmers in Fredericton, N.B. It was called the Farmer and Dairymen's Association, or the Farmers' Parliament. At this meeting a farmer spoke as follows:—"Do you farmers who live near to cities realize your exceptional opportunities to receive the highest prices for your choice products? I speak more particularly of eggs and poultry, for as you know, I am most interested in them. I receive the highest prices because I take the trouble to find out the class of eggs and poultry that brings the best values in the cities, and I try to produce the highest quality of goods which bring the highest prices. Now, why do not more of you do the same?" I need hardly add anything to these remarks. A farmer talking to farmers. A little effort to put up the eggs while strictly new laid, in a neat package, with the name of the party who sells them, and date when laid stamped on the eggs, as a guarantee of their quality. As I have said, the producer of the best is then in a position to demand the best prices. It is the same with his poultry. If his birds are well fleshed, cleanly picked and neatly dressed, he will certainly get a better value for them than if they were skinny, scrawny, and bristling with pin feathers. It is ever to be remembered that the demand now-a-days is for the best in all articles of farm produce. And as you, gentlemen, doubtless fully realize, the best cannot be produced without some extra effort, and extra effort usually means an extra price. But there are some practices on the part of certain farmers which mitigate against their obtaining the best prices, and in their own interests I mention some of them, as follows:—

Holding eggs after they are laid until enough is saved up to make it worth while taking them to market, the eggs meanwhile become stale. Let me relate an instance as illustrating this point. A farmer during a recent winter came into a large grocery store in this city. I was standing by. He had driven twenty-five miles and had twenty dozens of eggs as part of his load. As he entered the busy store he was referred to the Manager, when the following conversation occurred:—

FARMER.—Do you want any eggs?

MANAGER.—How many have you?

FARMER.—Twenty dozens.

MANAGER.—How many months old are they?

FARMER.—(Indignantly) They are not months old. They are fresh.

MANAGER.—How many hens have you?

The answer was given, and a price per dozen of fifteen cents below what was then being paid for new-laid eggs was offered and accepted. The Clerk-Manager evidently reasoned that as the farmer had not a large number of hens that the eggs first saved were stale and a price was offered accordingly. The foregoing conveys its own moral.

Let me add that when the man went outside I followed him and asked, 'What made you sell your eggs for 25 cents per dozen, when newly laid eggs are being sold at twice that value.' He said, 'I got the money any way.' I remarked 'That is not good business. I belong to the Experimental Farm and it is my duty to help you farmers. I will guarantee you a purchaser at 45 or 50 cents a dozen for your eggs if you will promise to send them in twice a week. Will you do it?' He said, 'Yes.' I said, 'I will write you in a day or two and tell you who to bring the eggs to. I will get you the price.' I found him a purchaser at 45 cents per dozen upon the condition that the farmer would send in his eggs, as he had promised, twice per week. I do not know whether that farmer did his part, but I know that I did mine. I also wrote and told him who to take or send the eggs to.

I say to farmers 'If you produce eggs of the right quality put them up neatly, marked, or, sell them while strictly fresh and you will surely get the highest price. And that is the position of affairs to-day.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Russell:

Q. How long would you consider that sterile eggs would remain fresh?

A. A sterile egg if well kept will retain its flavour for a week or even ten days. There is a great difference in their keeping quality as compared with the fertilized egg, especially in the summer season.

Another drawback is, that if the eggs are fertilized and when taken from the nest are placed in a warm cupboard or keeping place, germ development begins and if the eggs are held for any length of time, the germ meanwhile has made certain progress in the hatching process. An eminent embryologist writes 'Where there is a germ in the egg; as soon as conditions are favourable, or partly favourable, the natural process of hatching begins.' It is well to remember this, for a natural law does not cease its operation to suit the convenience of any one. So beyond doubt, if the eggs are kept in a warm place, germ development takes place, and when the eggs reach the buyer in the country store, or city, and eventually the consumer, they are more or less hatched, according to the length of time they have been held. I have not time to enter more minutely, as I would very much like to, into this phase of the question, which is a most important one. The remedy for this state of affairs is to have germless eggs: If intended for the highest class trade, market the eggs at least twice per week, and be sure that the hens which laid them have been well and cleanly fed, and free from vermin.

FORMATION OF EGG CIRCLES.

A comparatively new feature of poultry development—and one doubtless well known to many members of this Committee—is the formation of egg circles for the collecting of strictly new laid eggs and the placing of them in the hands of the consumer as quickly as possible. These egg circles are being formed all over the country, and are proving a great help to the farmers, more particularly those some distance from a market. I have not time to describe the *modus operandi* of these circles. Suffice it to say the eggs are all stamped with the names of the different parties who bring them or send them to a central point in a district, and at this point is an official who disposes of the eggs to wholesale or other buyers. Should a member of the circle send bad eggs he is detected by the stamp and is expelled from the circle or otherwise punished.

In the flourishing town of Peterborough they have had egg circles for some little time in operation, and the collecting of eggs and the sending of them to market is perhaps further advanced there than in any other place in Canada. The circles are now about to purchase a large building in the centre of the town, and co-operative farming associations will send their chickens to be there fattened and then shipped to the city markets. By doing so they will receive the highest price. They are doing very much the same now with their eggs.

As a result of these circles the producers have received better prices and the consumer a better article. In one large hotel in Montreal the consumption of eggs is said to have doubled as a result of their getting reliable eggs from one of these circles.

By Mr. Proulx:

Q. Are you referring to the Place Viger?

A. I mean more particularly the Windsor, but it is doubtless the same in the Place Viger. Mr. Hare, an officer of the Ontario Agricultural Department, is my authority for this statement.

BEST METHODS TO ADOPT IN PROCURING EGGS IN WINTER.

My last point is how to get the eggs in winter. This point is of great importance. It will be well for the farmer to realize sooner—rather than later—that in the artificial treatment of his fowls during the winter season he must imitate, as nearly as

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

possible, natural conditions. The hen when running abroad during the summer season supplies herself with material to make the yolk and white of the egg; lime to make shell; grit to grind up her food in her gizzard and to keep herself in robust health. In picking up this variety of diet she has had to make some effort, which means exercise. She keeps her body almost free from lice by vigorously dusting in dry and fine earth, preferably road dust. She exhibits a decided preference for roosting in the branches of trees, where she can have plenty of fresh air, rather than going into a stuffy poultry-house, and we should learn our lesson from the foregoing as to the proper feeding, treatment and housing of our birds. It is evident that the nearer we come to the natural in the treatment of our fowls the greater will be our success. The following information is given as embracing the desirable features mentioned. At this point allow me to remark that it is of the utmost importance that such information as I am relating to you should be sent or given to the farmers. In many cases it is absolutely required before right methods can be adopted. In proof of my statement, let me relate an incident. Not long ago a farmer came into my office and asked: 'What is the matter with my hens?' I inquired: 'What is the trouble?' He said: 'They are lying down on their sides and their legs stick out. They are sick and feverish.' I asked: 'What have you been feeding them on?' He said: 'Oh, peas and oats.' 'How long have you been feeding them peas and oats?' It was then coming on towards the end of January. 'Oh,' said he, 'since they went into winter quarters.' 'And have you never changed their diet?' His answer was in the negative. I said: 'Your hens are likely suffering from inflammation of the lower intestines, brought on by non-variety of diet. Feeding of the oats and peas from day to day without change. 'Do you give them lime to make shell or grit to grind up their food? Do you give them pure water to drink; do you clean out your poultry-house from time to time; are you sure that it and your hens are not infested with vermin; do you give your hens green food or vary their rations; do you keep them in exercise and give them plenty of fresh air?' 'Great Scott,' said the farmer, 'have you got to do all that?' I said: 'Yes. Remember that eggs are worth 50 cents a dozen.' 'Yes,' he said, 'and I want to get them to sell at that price.' 'Well,' I said, 'do you expect to get them if you feed your hens peas and oats all the time? Do you not realize that if it was a dead easy thing to get eggs in winter that they would not be so high priced as they are? It is wisely ordered that the thing that is easy to get is usually cheap in value.' We then had an old-fashioned talk together, and I am sure that farmer went away, at any rate, a wiser if not a happier man.

PROPER RATIONS FOR USE DURING WINTER.

First, I mention a ration embracing a mash, and I do so because the mash may afford opportunity to use the table and kitchen waste.

Morning.—Wheat, or at other times buckwheat, in quantities of from 8 to 10 pounds to 100 hens. Scatter in the litter on the floor of poultry house or scratch shed.

Noon.—Steamed lawn clippings or clover hay, three or four times a week. If thought necessary, give 5 pounds of oats to 100 hens. Scatter in litter on floor of the pen or house.

Afternoon.—Mash composed of such ground grains as are in most abundance, with waste of kitchen and table. Mix these with hot water and feed when cool, in quantities of two to three ounces to each hen. The following ground grains have been found to be effective when mixed into mash, with one part of meat meal:—

Shorts.	2 parts.
Ground oats.	1 part.
Cornmeal.	1 part.

APPENDIX No. 1

The above ground grains mixed in the proportions specified will be found suitable, should it be desired, to feed by the hopper method also. The usual practice is to intimately mix the ground grains and put them into one compartment of a hopper, usually divided into three parts. The second division of the hopper is frequently filled with ground oyster shells and grit, and the third with beef scrap, which is a coarser form of the meat-meal sometimes used in the wet mash. But there is no form of meal equal to cut green bones.

A whole-grain ration which has been found an egg-producer during the past two winters is composed of: One-third wheat, one-third buckwheat, one-third oats. The grains were fed in conjunction with roots, cut bone and grit, at the rate of 3 to 5 pounds per day to 24 hens.

The following rations, which are at present being used in our poultry division, have been found effective in the winter production of eggs:—

For hopper or dry feeding in unheated houses:—

Hens, 2 parts bran, 1 part ground oats, 10 per cent charcoal.

Pullets, same as foregoing with addition of one part cornmeal.

We make a distinction in the feeding of pullets and hens. Feed that will agree well with a pullet is apt to make hens between 18 months and 2 years old too fat.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Do you grind up the charcoal?

A. Yes.

By Mr. Russell:

Q. Have you ever tried rolled oats?

A. Yes, and it was most successful.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you ever fed any black or cayenne pepper in your mash?

A. No, we do not believe in stimulants of that kind.

By Mr. Russell:

Q. What do you think of mustard?

A. We are just about to try it.

Q. It is something new?

A. Yes. And very much recommended.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. Would that not be a substitute stimulant for pepper?

A. Perhaps. I will tell you more about it when we have tried it.

Q. You said a moment before that you did not believe in stimulants.

A. No. But very often red pepper is used in too great quantities.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. It gives the eggs a bad flavour?

A. It results in inflammation of the ovarian duct, and the egg is frequently expelled before the shell is formed. The result of feeding pepper, or highly seasoned condiments, in too great quantity is the laying of eggs with soft shells.

By Mr. Rankin:

Q. What is the particular advantage in using charcoal.

A. It is a good tonic and a corrective of the stomach and bowels. In individuals it is given in cases of heartburn or waterbrash, and has been found particularly effective in the treatment of young chickens.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. What bad effect do you find from the use of red pepper?

A. It is too stimulating in its effect. I can speak authoritatively on that point.

Now as to the rations I have outlined. They are generous, and all such rations are stimulating enough. Our great aim and object should be to keep the fowls in robust condition. When she is running at large in this country, she does not eat any pepper, but she picks up, as I have already stated, all that goes to make the yolk and white of the egg; a good shell; grit which enables her to grind her food in the gizzard and she also keeps herself in robust condition. We should take our cue from these facts.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. Are angleworms in large quantities good for hens or not?

A. I have never found angle worms do hens any harm where there is new ground; but on old ground that has been in use for years, it is said, they are the cause of gapes.

By Mr. Russell:

Q. Speaking of rolled oats. Have you fed such oats with the hulls on them?

A. What you call steel cut oats.

Mr. SPROULE.—No, it is not steel cut oats.

By Mr. Russell:

Q. I mean rolled oats with the hulls on them?

A. No, we have never tried them.

Q. You have not tried any mixing in that way?

A. No.

Q. It has been tried, and the hens seem to enjoy it.

A. I have seen it fed in a poultry establishment and the hens do well on it. I think it is fed by the hopper system.

Q. Yes, the fowls can get to the hopper any time.

A. Yes.

To continue in the matter of rations. In all cases grain was scattered in the litter on the floor in small quantity, morning and evening to incite to exercise in scratching for it. The pullets were given cracked corn at one of the daily grain rations. Cut green bone in proportion of 1 lb. to 15 or 16 hens, was given every other day.

Roots, grit, broken oyster shells and drinking water were regularly supplied. These essentials should always be in regular supply.

To recapitulate, I go over the following indispensable points in the winter production of eggs:—

1. The rations should be varied and fed regularly.

2. The poultry-house of the cotton front type has been found cheap in construction, wholesome, dry and tending to excellent egg laying. Plans can be had on application to our poultry department.

3. The farmer should build up by breeding from his best egg-layers a prolific egg-laying strain of fowls, or he should procure his birds from well-known egg-layers to breed from, or eggs from such a strain to hatch out.

4. The poultry-house should be kept scrupulously clean, free from vermin, and the hens should be well and cleanly fed on a varied diet. The nests should be kept equally clean.

APPENDIX No. 1

BEST FOOD AND TREATMENT OF YOUNG CHICKENS.

Chickens should be carefully but well fed from time of hatching until they reach the saleable age of $3\frac{1}{2}$, 4 or 5 months. In causing their satisfactory development the following food and management has been tried in our department with much success, namely:—

For the first thirty-six hours after hatching, little or no food should be given. The chicks require careful brooding more than anything else. Much depends upon their vitality. Some may be the better of a little food; if so, a few stale bread crumbs may be given.

Second and third days.—Stale bread soaked in skimmed milk and squeezed dry, or one part of finely-chopped hard-boiled egg and three parts of stale bread crumbs. Feed no more than the chickens will eat up without waste. If the chicks are hearty, feed every two or three hours. Continue this for a day or two, and then add granulated oatmeal. Continue the stale bread soaked in milk and granulated oatmeal for ten days, when finely-crushed corn may be added to the foregoing with advantage. After fourteen days give whole wheat, in small quantities at first.

As the chicks grow older, they should be given a mash composed of stale bread, shorts, oatmeal, ground meat, &c. Finely-cut bone or meat will be found a great incentive to growth at this stage.

On the chickens becoming eight weeks of age, their feeds may be reduced to three times per day. Care should be taken that they are generously fed the last time for the day. For drink give them skimmed milk and water. When the hen-hatched chickens are fully feathered, their mothers should be removed from them. The chickens will be found to return to their coops as usual, where they may be allowed to remain until removed to more commodious quarters in colony houses. On the incubator-hatched chickens becoming too large for the brooders they should be removed to colony houses.

MOULTING OF THE HENS IN SUMMER.

How the hens may be made to moult during the summer months is a question that is frequently asked, particularly at the beginning of the summer season. The following treatment has been successful here for several years. During the early part of July—after the breeding season is over—the fowls were placed on half the usual rations for 15 or 20 days. The effect of this treatment was the stoppage of egg production and the loosening of the old feathers. At the end of 15 or 20 days, the full rations were resumed. A little linseed meal may then be added to the mash with benefit. Before the beginning of operations to bring on the moult, the cock-birds were removed from the breeding pens and placed in compartments by themselves. The hens were then allowed to run in small fields where they could find insects, clover, grass, &c. In the feeding of the fowls during moult, care should be observed that they do not become too fat. The fowls are more apt to become over-fat from too generous feeding during the moult than after they have recommenced laying.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. The market for eggs at 40, 50 and 60 cents a dozen is very limited, is it not?

A. No. I think it the opposite.

Q. If we have as big a production of eggs in January as we have in June, can we get 40 or 50 cents a dozen for them?

A. My experience is that the more eggs we produce the more are eaten and the greater demand there is for them.

By Mr. Russell:

Q. Are you getting 50 cents a dozen at the present time?

A. No, the price is now down to 45 cents and will soon be lower.

Q. Do you sell the eggs from the farm?

A. We sell them to people who come for them, particularly in case of sickness and to certain customers.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. Why is the price falling?

A. Because of the approach of spring weather.

Q. Stamped eggs are not increasing on the market at this season?

A. Perhaps not, but we have to be careful, for unfortunately there will be a very unreliable class of eggs soon placed on the market—eggs which have been held in cold storage, &c., &c.

By Mr. Smith (Middlesex):

Q. In competition with the good ones?

A. Yes, I am very much afraid.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. In January they were getting 38 cents a dozen for eggs in the country. They were collected twice a week.

A. I paid a man at Burke's Falls myself 45 cents a dozen for strictly new laid eggs. I got them as a favour for friends in this city.

By Mr. McColl:

Q. I understand your contention is this, that if all egg-producers would follow the rule of sending their eggs into the market strictly fresh-laid, the consumption of eggs would increase probably ten-fold and the high price would remain?

A. Undoubtedly, as is proved by our decreasing imports and the increasing value of our home egg market. The high prices are not paid for the third or fourth rate but for the highest class article.

By Mr. Russell:

Q. I know a gentleman who was offered four cents an egg last fall?

A. That is what they get in Guelph O.A.C. poultry Department for eggs in bulk from a Toronto dealer.

Q. The party I refer to was gathering them. Will all stamped eggs bring five cents a dozen more than the market price?

A. Yes, and sometimes even more for a guaranteed and choice article.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Don't you think that the high price of meats of late has accounted a good deal for the large increase in the consumption of eggs, and in raising the price?

A. Undoubtedly that is one factor. I have not gone into that phase of the question. The different causes of increased prices is matter for an address in itself.

By Mr. Russell:

Q. Do you really think that is the cause, or do you think that people have found out that eggs are better in quality than formerly?

A. Doubtless that is another cause. I think that they have also found out that there is just as much nutriment in two fresh eggs as in a pound of steak.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. I think there can be no doubt that the demand for strictly fresh eggs is great. I have frequently gone into a first-class hotel and asked for eggs for a meal and could not get them?

A. I have been in the same position. I have been during winter on a Pullman dining or buffet car and paid the highest price, but the eggs I got were far from

APPENDIX No. 1

fresh and certainly abominably flavoured. Why should such be? A remarkable phase of this egg business is well expressed by Mr. J. A. Gunn, President of the Montreal Produce Exchange when he recently said in an address:—‘It is a remarkable fact that to the large purchasers there are several million dollars worth of eggs lost every year because they are not fit for sale, while consumers in Montreal were willing to pay the highest price for strictly new-laid eggs.’ He had no hesitancy in saying that ‘half a million of dollars was lost to the farmers of the country every year by their sending in rotten eggs.’ You will see how necessary is instruction to the farmers along these lines. I am sorry the time is up. I would like to show how this great loss occurs and how in a great many cases the eggs are partially hatched before they are off the farmers’ hands, and the farmers do not know it. Indeed, the trouble frequently begins with the eggs laid in the nest. I refer of course to fertilized eggs. Hens sitting on a nest full of fertilized eggs, if only for a few hours will cause germ development. The farmers should know all these facts. They have an all-important effect on the keeping quality of the egg. I have no time to say more on these very important facts. The large purchasing concerns say ‘We are willing to pay the highest values for a guaranteed new-laid egg, but we will not pay these prices for partially hatched eggs.’ Now I want the farmers to get the best prices.

Mr. SPROULE.—The chickens have not exactly got their feathers on when the egg is eaten.

Mr. GILBERT.—No, but they are far advanced that way in too many instances.

By Mr. Best:

Q. If a farmer lives six to eight miles from the market and has one hundred hens and he gets three dozen eggs per day, it would not pay that man to bring his eggs that distance to sell them. He has to keep them one week and try to make a weekly trip to the market?

A. Let the eggs then be strictly non-fertilized and there will be no danger of germ development. It is to be remembered, as a rule, the eggs on the farms of the country are fertilized and germ development will surely take place when conditions are favourable.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. In our section the egg-buyers come twice a week and gather up all the eggs?

A. Yes, that is the right way. I should really have divided farmers into three classes:—1—those that are near towns and cities; 2—those that are near express offices; 3—those who are away back.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. What plan have you for preventing the eggs lying in the country store-keepers’ store for a long time before they go to the larger markets in Montreal?

A. The President of the Montreal Produce Exchange has the proper way of dealing with that difficulty, and that is to have a law passed to punish people who sell partially hatched or rotten eggs, as they do in the United States.

Q. The result of your investigation is that for both large eggs and small eggs it is nourishment and actual money’s worth that count?

A. Yes.

By Mr. McCraney:

Q. There has been an importation in Toronto of Siberian eggs which are largely used by bakers. Has your department any information as to the extent of the importation?

A. No information. In further answer to Mr. Sealey, let me say that the smaller eggs are laid by pullets as a rule, the larger eggs by hens. There is no discrimination made in the value of eggs according to size. Yet, some large purchasing concerns do

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

discriminate. I once sent several dozens of new laid eggs to a well-known dealer in St. Catherine street, Montreal, and I wrote asking him to place his own value on them. I did this as an experiment, and the dealer wrote back saying: 'I allow 35 cents a dozen for your pullets eggs and 50 cents for the hens eggs.' The nutriment in both cases is the same, and as to that much depends on the quality of the food eaten by the hens.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. You mean to say the nourishment to the human being is just as great from a small egg as from a large egg?

A. Yes.

Q. I do not mean proportionately, but the whole egg?

A. In that case I prefer the larger egg of the hen.

Q. The one contains two cubic inches of material and the other three inches. Is there as much nourishment in the two inches of material as in the three inches?

A. No.

Q. It is just in proportion then?

A. Exactly so.

Q. And the three inches contain one-third more than the two inches?

A. I should say that is what it amounts to.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Is it a fact that black hens lay larger eggs than the white ones—the Black Spanish, for instance?

A. Yes, in many instances.

Q. Compare them with the White Leghorns?

A. It is very much a matter of strain. All large egg-laying is a matter of strain. There are some breeds, like the Black Minorcas and Houdans, which usually lay very large eggs. So do some varieties of Leghorns.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. Do you recommend the selling of eggs by count, as they are done now, or by weight? Do you say that the man who produced three cubic inches of material in his egg should not sell them at the same price as the eggs with two inches of material?

A. I have contended for long that the eggs should be sold by weight. A member of this Committee, a gentleman you may remember, Mr. John McMillan, was preparing a Bill at the time of his death to that effect. He was a great advocate of selling eggs by weight, and I certainly think they should be so sold.

The CHAIRMAN.—I desire, Mr. Gilbert, to congratulate you upon the address you have delivered this morning, and which has been one of the most valuable and practical that we have ever had. I also wish to express my great pleasure at the large attendance of members this morning and the great interest which they have displayed in the subjects discussed. If acted upon by the farmers your address will be worth a large amount of money to them.

Committee adjourned.

Certified correct,

A. G. GILBERT.

CO-OPERATIVE FRUIT CULTURE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

COMMITTEE ROOM No. 34,

WEDNESDAY, February 1, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at eleven a.m., Mr. Schell, Chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN.—We are pleased to have with us to-day Mr. James E. Johnson, of Simcoe, Ont., Secretary of the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association, who is to speak on 'Co-operative Fruit Culture, and Marketing of Same.' Most of you have heard something of the work that has been accomplished through the association of farmers, in the growing and shipping and handling of apples particularly, although their work has extended in a measure to other fruit. The work that has been done by our government in eliciting information on scientific lines, as you know, has been a very great work. But one of the greatest difficulties has been to get the information put into practical operation. Millions of dollars have been spent along technical lines relating to agriculture, and if the farmers of this country were to put into practical operation half of the valuable information that has been presented to the public from our colleges, from our experts, from our experimental farms, we have been told that the crop of the Dominion of Canada might easily be doubled. Perhaps that is not too extravagant a statement to make. The object of bringing Mr. Johnson before us this morning is to tell the committee some of the practical work that has been done by the farmers in the county of Norfolk where they have co-operated, where the example of one farmer has spread, so that from a few who first joined together in the cultivating, spraying and handling of their fruit, quite a large number have now joined the association, and thousands of barrels of apples are now being produced annually through this association. Mr. Johnson is the secretary and treasurer of that association, and as a practical handler and a practical grower of fruit we thought he could give us some very valuable information.

We are, therefore, very much pleased to have him with us this morning, and I trust you will give him kind attention. I think, perhaps, it would be wise—as I have before hinted to the committee—to allow the speaker to complete his address without much interruption, and for members of the committee to discuss the paper after he has concluded his remarks. I have much pleasure in now calling on Mr. Johnson to address you.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

Mr. JAMES E. JOHNSON.—Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall be brief in my remarks, and I will not dwell upon any particular part of this great subject of agriculture very long. I shall endeavour to inform you in as practical a way as I can of the success which has been accomplished in the county of Norfolk in co-operative fruit culture and the marketing of the same, and to tell you that equal success can be achieved in many other counties in Ontario and other provinces of the Dominion.

The upbuilding of agriculture is one of the greatest subjects that could occupy any person's attention. Unfortunately, our farmers have been inclined to indepen-

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

dence from childhood, and in many cases we find jealousy combined with that independence. In order to best solve the problem of how to advance the growth of any industry public funds should be devoted to the spreading of education and the demonstration of sound principles in such a manner as would benefit every man, woman and child in the Dominion. Agriculture being the greatest industry in this country, it should receive the greatest amount of consideration. It is an industry that should be taught in every room of every school in Canada, and in this connection an effort should be made to have the children appreciate the great value of co-operation. There should be works on bookkeeping available for farmers at reasonable prices, and these should reach as many farmers as possible. It is absolutely necessary for a modern farmer to keep a set of books so that at the end of each year he may be able to tell in which department of his farm he is making the most money. By following a system of bookkeeping the farmers will acquire most valuable information as to what part of their farms is paying them the best. This would lead to the farmers paying special attention to that branch of agriculture which yielded the greatest crop. Some farmers make a specialty of horse breeding, and other of other branches of stock-raising. A great many engage in dairying, others again in the raising of crops for canning purposes; and fruit growing is by no means the least important of the great agricultural industry. In this connection practical demonstrations are of great value, showing the farmers how to specialize in everything that can be grown on their farms and impressing on them that the great secret of success is to invest money in order to make money. This has been specially demonstrated in the apple growing industry in the county of Norfolk since 1903.

Before dwelling on the growing of apples, I want to give you an instance of a farm of 100 acres, just one mile outside the town of Simcoe, which I bought four years ago. I do this to demonstrate the point that one must invest money in order to make money. This farm has been carried on as a dairy and wheat growing farm, but I bought it with the intention of going into fruit growing. I have planted on that farm in the last four years no less than five thousand trees, and found it necessary to grow hoe crops for the growth of those trees. Two years ago my sales off that hundred acre farm amounted to seven thousand dollars, and last year they were eight thousand five hundred dollars, being probably at the least, three times the amount of sales which was derived in former years from that farm.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. Were these sums derived from fruit growing?

A. Principally fruit and vegetable growing. I raised strawberries, potatoes and hoe crops generally. The next point of importance to consider is what were the net profits. I invested large sums of money in labour, which is certainly beneficial to our country. I netted two years ago over three thousand dollars, and last year the amount was over four thousand dollars. I did very little of the farm work myself, excepting the general management, and what has been done there can be done on many other farms in this Dominion.

By Mr. Armstrong:

Q. What kind of labour do you employ and what wages do you pay?

A. I employ the home labour that is available and the wages are \$1.50 a day. Excepting my year men. I am paying one of these \$350, and the other \$400 per annum, with free house, fuel and garden produce.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. \$1.50 a day is not very big wages.

A. No, it is not.

Q. How many acres have you devoted to strawberry cultivation?

APPENDIX No. 1

A. Last year I had 15 acres, and the production amounted to ninety-eight thousand baskets.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. Is the soil a sandy loam?

A. A sandy and clay loam.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Were these strawberries grown in between the trees?

A. They were.

Q. Are we to understand that that helps the growth of the trees?

A. It certainly does.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. Have you had any results from the trees yet?

A. Not from the apples, but I had one-third to one bushel of peaches from many of my three-year old trees last year.

By Mr. Currie (Prince Edward):

Q. Speaking of your fruit trees, do you deduct interest on your investment?

A. Yes.

By Mr. Edwards:

Q. I understand that you planted five thousand trees some four years ago?

A. I did that in the last four years.

Q. What proportion of your trees has lived?

A. Of apple trees?

Q. Yes, I refer to apple trees.

A. I should say about 98 per cent.

Q. Have you any special method of planting your trees that you would suggest as advisable?

A. No, I cannot say that I have. Planting is so well known by every one that I cannot say that I have any special plan to recommend.

Q. In explanation of my reason for asking the question, some people advise—I do not know whether it is correct or not—that it is well to dip the roots of the tree in water or in soft mud.

A. Puddle the roots.

Q. Yes, before putting it into the ground. Other people think it advisable to put on manure. I have heard that spoken of the putting of manure in the bottom of the hole where the tree is planted. What is your opinion in regard to that?

A. Very fine rotted manure may be all right, but I have my doubts, because the coarse manure would be a detriment, it would dry out the soil.

Q. Do you use either plan?

A. No.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. Do you puddle the roots of your trees?

A. No.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. Do you find that apple trees do well on clay ground?

A. Yes.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. What kind of apple trees have you?

A. We have all varieties practically. That is one of the troubles of our association. Last year we had sixty varieties.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Have you good drainage?

A. Many of our farms have underground drainage. My farm has four and a quarter miles of tiling.

Let me refer back to apple growing generally, to the year 1896. I think all apple growers remember that year, which was one with an exceedingly good crop. We likewise had a good crop in the province of Ontario in 1898, and apples brought a very fine price.

By Mr. Best:

Q. Have the apples been falling off in quality since 1896?

A. I will answer that right now. From that time on the quality in Ontario, excepting perhaps in the case of cider apples, has been going back. From that time up to 1903 in the county of Norfolk there were not over five well cared for apple orchards. The fungus diseases materially affected the crop, so that the apples in unsprayed orchards were mostly only fit for evaporating, canning and cider purposes, and that condition exists even at the present time. Now, I am speaking generally of our southern Ontario apple growing community along Lake Erie. I have also travelled through the Lake Huron district and in the east, and I have found that where the spraying was not carefully done the apples were inferior. In 1903 and 1904 I gave practical demonstrations of the value of spraying in Norfolk county. I had been trying to get many of the growers in this vicinity to improve their orchard management, but it seemed impossible. In the year 1903 I purchased a farm that had an orchard on it. I set out to demonstrate to our people there in the county what I could do in careful orchard management. There were many who would come to me and say, 'It is useless for you to try to spray the trees; it has been demonstrated to be of no value.' That was the very reason it was so hard to get many people at that time to become interested in spraying. The demonstrations which I carried on in the county of Norfolk during the years 1903 and 1904 have, I am confident, been worth thousands of dollars to that county. I might go further and say that it has meant thousands of dollars to every county in the province of Ontario, because the same formula which I introduced there has practically spread all over the province of Ontario. It has been sent to Nova Scotia and many other places.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. Do you have to contend with scale?

A. We do not in that section.

Q. Is it your own formula?

A. No. It was a formula I received from New York State, from some of the best growers there, and a formula which I have had printed in every horticultural paper in the Province.

Q. What is your formula?

A. The Bordeaux Mixture with excess of lime.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. More than the ordinary quantity?

A. Yes, about four or five times.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. Do you ever use the lime and sulphur mixture?

A. The lime and sulphur mixture is a mixture that is necessary and must be used in all places where they have the San Jose Scale, and the Leaf Blister Mite. I may say that that insect is just putting in its appearance in the province of Ontario. Now, there are many orchards that have this Blister Mite that do not know what is wrong with their trees. But there is no use of using the Bordeaux Mixture for that disease. Therefore it is necessary that we use the lime and sulphur mixture in the first spraying of the apple orchards. The formula which I will use this year in my own orchards will be the lime and sulphur for first spray and the Bordeaux for second and third sprays, excepting in experimental plots.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. I apprehend that the lime and sulphur is a very cheap spraying material and in that way may be commended.

By Mr. Armstrong:

Q. It has been in use in the Niagara District for years?

A. Yes, the lime-sulphur spray for the San Jose scale has been in use in the Niagara District. The spray mixture I recommend now would be a lime-sulphur mixture, concentrated form, either made at home or bought from the manufacturers.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. You mean that which is already in use?

A. While the trees are dormant, use the concentrated mixture with a test of 32 Baume, using 8 parts of water and one of lime-sulphur. Now, that is stronger than many manufacturers will advise you to use it.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. What proportion of lime and sulphur?

A. The proportions I will give later. It can be manufactured at home, or you can purchase it from the manufacturers who are already established in the province of Ontario.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. Do you buy the manufactured stuff, or do you make it yourself?

A. I make it for my own orchards.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Is it much cheaper to make it yourself?

A. Considerably.

By Mr. Henderson:

Q. In the manufacture of this lime stuff for mixture do you find it profitable to use a high-class lime or a 25 per cent lime?

A. You must use a high-class lime.

Q. I had a statement from one of these men who manufactured the lime-sulphur mixture, that if he had known a year sooner to use a high-class of lime instead of using a 40 to a 45 per cent lime, he would have saved \$1,000 a year?

A. That is correct. It is necessary to use a high-class grade of lime, for if you use a low grade it is hard to tell how much lime is necessary.

FORMATION AND GROWTH OF NORFOLK FRUIT GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

Now, I wish to take up the co-operative work. In 1906, I formed the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association, and all I could get together after hours and days of talk was seventeen. I canvassed all the best fruit growers in the county and tried to get

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

them to organize a fruit growers' association. That year we shipped 4,000 barrels of apples. In 1907, we were successful in getting 52 members and the output was 10,000 barrels. In 1908, there were 152 members and the output was 15,000 barrels. In 1909, there were 188 members and the output was 19,000 barrels. In 1910, there were 335 members and the output was 36,000 barrels, with a valuation of \$103,494.56. That will demonstrate to you the growth of our association; five years ago only 17 members; last year 335. And I am sure I am safe in saying that we will have at least 400 this year. Now, besides the 335 members we had last year, the work of orchard growing has spread so that there are about 25 other well cared for orchards in the county, the owners of which are not members of the association. Many say that if the association would pick their apples they would join the association. That is the only reason practically why they do not join. They are paying for their picking from double to treble each year what it is costing our members as a whole, because on an average they sell at a considerably less figure than I am able to net our members. I may say that we have shipped our apples to all markets. During the five years under review we have shipped about fifty per cent to the Northwest provinces, whilst twenty-five per cent went to the United States and twenty-five per cent to export.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. On which shipments did you make the most money?

A. All the apples were sold at the same price. We have had the same figure from all places.

By Mr. Armstrong:

Q. What kinds did you sell to the Northwest and what kinds to the United States?

A. Each year excepting the present, we have divided our districts into stations and given the same varieties to each place. That is excepting this year, when we shipped four cars of Greenings to the Chicago market separately.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. Are the apples picked that you sell to England?

A. Yes.

By Mr. Armstrong:

Q. They have been specially selected?

A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. They are graded the same to all the markets?

A. Yes, they are graded the same to all the markets.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. Do you send poor apples to the west?

A. We send exactly the same quality of apples to the west as to export and to the United States; there is no difference whatever.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. The grade is the same for all markets?

A. Yes, and our brand of apples is becoming well known in all markets.

By Mr. Best:

Q. Is your net profit on apples the same in the case of those sent to the north west as in the case of those sent to England?

A. We send all apples f.o.b. Simcoe, spot cash before the wheels turn.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. McCali:

Q. I would like to know if the grade has improved since the organization of your association? What is the percentage of first class you get now as compared with the percentage you got the first year? That will show the result of your organization and of the methods you follow. You need not answer the question now if you are going to refer to it later on?

A. I can answer the question now. In the year 1903, when I took first class care of my orchard, I got just as high class fruit as we are getting this year; we did our work so thoroughly that we got the same grade. But I consider this: taking the 335 orchards—and practically there are a great many more than that, because many of our members are renting other orchards—the percentage of high quality apples in the county of Norfolk at the present time, compared with six years ago, is about nine times greater than to-day. There were four thousand barrels shipped in 1906—

Q. What percentage of the total grades as number one?

A. That differs with each season.

Q. Could you give us a comparative classification of the crop of the first year to show how the treatment had improved the grade? That would be of value to the committee?

A. In answer to that let me say that if the growers had done their work thoroughly in 1903, they would have extinguished all fungus diseases and all insect enemies for that year. Coming to 1910, in that same orchard if you did not do your work quite as thoroughly you would not get nearly as good results as you obtained in 1903. It is the thoroughness of the work done each year which tells.

Q. What percentage of this year's crop was first class?

A. Our percentage this year was 76.5 of number one's.

Q. What was the percentage the first or second year of your organization?

A. I could not give you that information. Very often we are liable to get hail in our section and that will of necessity result in the grading of quite a lot of number two's. This year we had some hail and yet the percentage of number ones was 76.5. Any of the gentlemen here who are in the apple business will agree that that is a high percentage of firsts.

Q. How do you get the apples inspected?

A. This year there were twelve inspectors appointed to go around and look after the inspection of fruit. In addition, there is a government inspector who frequently visits the orchards and shows the packers how to take care of the fruit and pack it in the best manner.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. Was the 76.5 per cent of number one's the percentage of all fruit that was produced on the trees?

A. No, not at all.

Q. That is quite a different thing.

A. Certainly it is.

Q. That puts a different colour on the thing, because you might take 76 per cent and if you refused to take the balance it might leave 90 per cent of culls out of the whole product.

A. Our culls are sold to canning or evaporated apple factories or cider mills. I therefore cannot give the percentage of culls.

Q. What percentage would your number one's bear to the total?

A. I could not give you that information because some of our farmers sell their cider apples and there is no way of getting figures. Some orchards would be far higher than others in the high grade yield. It is according to the care and attention bestowed on the orchard.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. Then, Mr. Johnson, your association always packs apples that will grade higher than culls?

A. That is all. We only pack two grades, number one's and number two's

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. That is all that the packers pack now excepting for evaporating purposes?

A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. Speaking of your own orchard what proportion of apples have you been obliged to sell as culls, roughly speaking?

A. That would vary with different years. Now, you take some years we will barrel up to 80 or 90 per cent of high grade apples, and other years not more than from 65 to 70 per cent.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. That is number one's and two's?

A. Yes, and in our orchard the balance would be culls

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. All these orchards have had first-class care, have they not?

A. It is impossible to get the whole 335 growers of our association to give their orchards equal care. Therefore there is as much difference in orchards, practically, as there is in men.

Q. Have you any authority as manager to see that they do keep their orchards up?

A. No, simply ask them to do it, and they will be the losers at the end of the season if they do not take first-class care. We are very careful with our own orchards.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. You said you had twelve inspectors. What are their duties?

A. They are representatives of the manager in different localities. We loaded at 19 stations this year. I will give a certain section to one inspector who must look after the packing and the shipping. That is the only way in which the manager can handle such a large association, by dividing it up into districts.

By Mr. Chisholm (Huron):

Q. Is every barrel that is sent out inspected?

A. Certainly not, the barrels are not all inspected. The apples are packed mostly by our growers, although we have forty or fifty packers at work besides. But we have been able to show our growers that it will pay them to be honest in their work, and we have accomplished that to a very large extent.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. In the West we have very great difficulty in getting apples from the East that are up to the standard at all?

A. In what part of the year?

Q. In almost every part of the year. We buy from the dealers in Winnipeg who secure carloads of the Eastern crop for the West. We buy from them in Winnipeg and we have found the very greatest difficulty in getting apples from Ontario that are up to the standard at all?

A. I quite agree with you. I have sometimes been in those far Western markets and really felt as though I was ashamed to be a Canadian.

Q. And so have I.

A. But still let us not put all the blame upon the apple buyer for that. I have been in the apple business for a good many years. We will employ this man with a

APPENDIX No. 1

gang of packers, and that man with a gang of packers, and therein lies our difficulty in always securing men who will pack the apples of the high grade that should be packed.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. But your association has succeeded in doing that?

A. Yes, we have succeeded in doing it.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. I should think your twelve inspectors would have charge of that work

A. They have charge of it.

Q. Very often we buy a carload of number one's and upon opening them up we find them nothing but number three's. That gives you a great deal of trouble.

THE PACKING OF APPLES BY THE ASSOCIATION.

A. I might just take up this packing of apples. This is a circular that has been issued to all our members. (Reads):—

'PACKING OF APPLES IN BARRELS.

'First get your ladders, picking baskets, packing table, stemmer, press, leveller and plank on hand, also engage your pickers and packers so when your apples are ready to pack you are in a position to do so. Packing demonstrations will be given. Study the rules below for the handling of your apples.

'2nd. Picking should be done with care, and handle the apples so they will not be bruised. Never pick apples off the ground and put in the barrels with hand picked No. 1 or No. 2 apples.

'3rd. Drive all quarter hoops down firmly and nail with three nails in each upper quarter hoop. Then drive hoops well down on the end of the barrel with poorest head and nail with four nails. Then head line by using four nails in each head liner. Exercise care in headlining and drive nails slanting. If nails show through to outside of barrel don't clinch, but take out and drive right so it does not show through. Now, take out the other end of the barrel and clinch the quarter hoop nails. Use $1\frac{1}{4}$ inch wire nails.

'Next stencil your barrel.

'Now you are ready for packing.

'If using paper place this in the end of the barrel. With great care pick out and stem your facers, not the largest, but the average size of grade you are packing. See that every apple is a perfect one with the very best colour you have to choose from. You should not have any difference in size of your facers, but if you should have, place the smaller apples to the outside row and the larger ones to the centre. A good many of unexperienced packers do the opposite. Always place stems down, with the exception of long shapely varieties, as Gilliflower and Bellflower, which lay red cheeks down. The sorting must be done carefully, and reject all worms, fungus spots, bruises and unshapely apples both for No. 1's and No. 2's. Now, place your barrel on a plank and after each basket of apples is emptied, give the barrel several quick, short shakes. You will have to be governed according to the size of the apples you are packing how full to fill the barrels before using the leveller. At all times level so it will take one row, blossom end up, on top and leave your apples about half-inch above staves. Care must be exercised in racking down very carefully. Nail and headline your barrel and same is ready for shipment.

'Size for Snows, Golden Russet and kindred size varieties, $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches and over, of good colour, for No. 1's and $2\frac{3}{8}$ inches and over, showing some colour, for No. 2's.'

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

Now you will notice this is a higher grade of apples that we are asked to pack by the Fruit Marks Act, and that is what I am trying to accomplish. I want to build up a reputation for the finest quality of fruit which always demands the best price. Price is soon forgotten, quality is never forgotten.

By Mr. Sexsmith:

Q. Then your association only packs No. 1's and No. 2's?

A. Yes.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. Does your association brand everything the same?

A. Everything has the same brand.

Q. What is your brand?

A. 'Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association' in big letters.

By Mr. Chisholm (Huron):

Q. Does the name of the party who grows the apples go with the barrel?

A. Yes, every name is printed on a card that goes with the barrel. I will deal with these cards very shortly. (Reads):—

'Size for Spies, Greenings, Kings and kindred sized varieties, 2½ inches and over, of good colour, for No. 1's, and 2½ inches and over, showing some colour, for No. 2's.

'Don't pack any No. 2's in Talman Sweets or early fall apples, such as Jen-neting, Calverts, St. Lawrence, Maiden Blush. &c. Pack very few No. 2's in odd winter varieties. Let No. 2's chiefly consist of Snows, Greenings, Spies, Baldwins and Russets, and reject all worms, fungus and bruises.

The number on every barrel is the growers name, and each grower will be paid for his fruit according to varieties and quality, and it is the duty of each grower to see that his apples are packed according to the above instructions, as you are personally responsible.

4th. Don't allow your barrels to get wet either before or after packing. When apples are packed either load on cars or place in a sheltered cool place with plenty of ventilation.

5th. All members should help to build up our reputation in honest packing of apples."

So you see it is a very nice thing that 335 of our members can learn by means of this circular how to properly pack apples according to grade.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. How do you find out when apples are not packed properly, do you open the barrels?

A. We have our twelve inspectors.

Q. And do they open up the barrels?

A. They open up many barrels and they will drop into many an orchard from time to time.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Have you often found that apples were not packed according to the sample, or according to directions?

A. Not often. We have encountered such instances, but they generally occur through ignorance.

Q. You seem to be more fortunate in that respect than you are with your good roads?

A. Now, let me read another circular (reads):

APPENDIX No. 1

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE NORFOLK FRUIT
GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

SIMCOE, Ont., Sept. 6, 1910.

The manager of your association has carefully prepared rules for packing of apples, which kindly follow very closely. Any member not accustomed to the packing of apples should not attempt to pack his own apples, but have your manager send you an experienced packer so you may learn how to pack apples. We want all of our members to learn How to Pack, as all apples are settled for according to grades, variety and packing.

The cooerage of a barrel is very important.

See that all quarter hoops are driven down firmly before nailing, also the end of barrels you head-line.

If the barrel has shrunk so top hoops drive down below the end of the staves, take hoop off and put it back on, adding a small piece of hoop on the under side of the hoop.

See that every barrel is in perfect shipping condition.

Only pack No. 1's and No. 2's of the following varieties, Greenings, Baldwins, Spy, Snow, King, Spitz.

All other varieties, both fall and winter, pack only No. 1's excepting where a tree of the varieties are not good enough to take a large proportion of No. 1's; in such case pack them up A Good Grade and mark them all No. 2's.

Our packed apples are sold at a good price this year and we must give the buyer good value. We will also get a good price for all our cull apples. Rubber stamps, with your name and address, will be furnished to every member of our association for the sum of 25 cents for both rubber stamp and pad, and it is the duty of every grower to see his name is stamped on the head of every barrel, also on the card placed inside of the barrel. The packing of our association apples this year in first-class workmanship will mean to our members next year twenty-five cents per barrel advance, with apple crop conditions equal to this year. I know that every member of our association is anxious to advance our reputation for honest packed apples. Packing demonstration notice will be given later. Ladders, presses, stencils, headliners, nippers, pick-baskets on hand. Make known your wants to the manager.

'Yours respectfully,

'JAMES E. JOHNSON,

'*Manager, Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association.*

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. Where do you sell the apples?

A. We ship 50 per cent to the Northwest, 25 per cent for export and 25 per cent to the United States.

Q. Have you had any complaints about back packing?

A. I have had this year four complaints.

Q. I mean from the buyers in distant parts?

A. I have no complaints from individuals, and I received 260 letters congratulating us upon the quality.

By Mr. Burrell:

Q. You say 25 per cent for export; what do you mean by that?

A. I mean shipped to the old country, Glasgow, Scotland, particularly. I shipped 25 per cent to the United States, but we do not regard that as export.

Q. That is this year?

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

A. No, for the last five years.

Q. An average of five years?

A. Yes.

Now we place a card in No. 1 barrels and a card in No. 2 barrels

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. With the man's name on each card?

A. Yes. Here is one from one of our members, Alex. Wallace, Simcoe, Ont. 'This is a No. 1 barrel of apples grown and packed by Norfolk Fruit Growers Association, Simcoe, Ont., Canada. As growers of these apples we are desirous of establishing and advancing a reputation for honest packing of fruit. We want every consumer to know our pack, and to realize that for quality and flavour we are unexcelled in the growing and packing of Canadian apples. We cordially invite and ask the user of this barrel to write the manager his candid opinion; always refer to the grower's name on this card.'

Q. That is signed by you?

A. That is signed by the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association, James E. Johnson, manager.

Here is a letter from Winnipeg which came back: 'We have just finished using a barrel of Northern Spy apples grown and packed by your association, and am writing to show our appreciation of the same. They are without doubt the most luscious fruit we have had the pleasure of eating for some time. British Columbia or Washington grown fruit cannot be compared in any shape or form with these apples, either for cooking, eating or for a good hardy fruit. The grower's name is Alexander Wallace, Simcoe, Ont.'

It is quite necessary that we should all boom the country we live in. Now, here is another card sent back, Grower, James E. Johnson, Simcoe, Ont., sent from Gladstone, Man.

'In reply to your request on opposite side permit me to say that the two barrels of No. 1 apples which was packed by your company has given entire satisfaction. They are away ahead of any apples we have been able to get in this town for the last twenty years. They are honest packed.

'Yours truly,

J. K. McLENNAN.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. Do you sell to wholesalers in Winnipeg?

A. In 1909, we sold to the Rogers Fruit Company; Bright, Emory, & Co., Winnipeg, and Stockton & Mallinson, Regina. Last year we sold a large percentage of our crop to J. G. Anderson, a local buyer in Ontario, and he shipped a large percentage to the Winnipeg and other Northwest markets. Mr. Anderson unfortunately was taken ill with typhoid at the beginning of the apple season, so it was necessary that he employ some one to handle the orders for him. I am sure he is well pleased with the results. I had a communication saying that he was very glad that this year he had purchased his apples from an association like the Norfolk Fruit Association, because he felt that having been sick he would not lose anything.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. Would it not be better to sell direct to the retailer?

A. Right you are. I think the day will come when probably we may do so, but there is just a question upon that. The retailer will not forward his money to the point of shipment before the car-wheels turn. He wants 30 days, and then sometimes there are some retailers who when they get the apples into their possession are liable to make complaints.

APPENDIX No. 1

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar).—They are all contracts in the west

Mr. JOHNSON.—Well, I have had considerable experience in handling apples in a wholesale way. I have packed a great many apples. That has been my business for a good many years and I have generally sold to the retail trade, and the people of the northwest will have to be different from the ordinary people if we do not get complaints from some of the retail dealers. Now, here comes another letter from Newbury, Berks, England.

‘I have often thought that I would send a reply to the cards that you put in barrels of your apples, so at last I have managed to do so. I must say that they turn out in splendid condition. We never get more than three or four bad ones in a barrel. I consider that that is very good when you think of the distance they have to be sent. No. 1 Baldwins we are having at present. I myself am an assistant in a grocery and general store in this town and I should not mind coming to Canada on a fruit farm. If it would not be troubling you too much, would you let me know what prospects I would have of getting a job on a fruit farm. I cannot honestly say that I have much knowledge of fruit farming, but am not afraid of work and think that I should soon learn. Are there any agencies out there that find you jobs when you arrive, or does your association find any for immigrants? I should like to know if you would kindly do so. I might say my age is 24, and the apples were packed and grown by Mr. John Dyer, Walsh, Ont.

Now, I may say I have received many letters like that from people wanting to come to this country and wanting to find out about our fruit industry.

Mr. SPROULE.—You appear to be doing a little immigration agency work on the side.

Mr. JOHNSON.—Here is another card from Nutfield.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. Where is Nutfield?

A. I think it is in England. I am quite sure it is. This came back on January 14th. Here is a letter also from L. E. Bliss, Crown Fire Ranging & Timber Office, Ombabika, via Nepigon.

‘I purchased from Revillion Bros., of Nepigon, two barrels of apples. In both barrels I found a notice requesting purchasers to notify the association in what condition the apples were found when opened. One of these barrels was No. 1 Greening. Grower’s name was E. Watson, Simcoe. The other barrel was No. 1 King. Grower’s name, William Burt, Simcoe. The apples in both these barrels were in splendid condition. I will just give you an idea how much handling these barrels had after they left Nepigon. They were hauled to a small steamer and put on board. They were taken 12 miles by this boat and put in a small tramway and then hauled 18 miles, when they were put in a larger steamer and brought 60 miles across Lake Nepigon. The steamer was unable to reach the dock as Ombabika Bay, which is part of Lake Nepigon, is frozen over. They had to unload at the Gap, a distance of 14 miles from where I live. I sent my dog team out and brought the barrels in, and in taking them out of the barrels to pick out the rotten ones, I am pleased to add that we did not get one rotten apple. In conclusion I may add that I will not have the slightest hesitation in recommending apples shipped by your association to my friends.

‘Yours truly,

‘(Signed) L. E. BLISS.’

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

PRICES OBTAINED BY THE ASSOCIATION FOR ITS APPLES.

By Mr. Hughes:

Q. What price do your apples sell for in Winnipeg?

A. We have sold all the way from \$5 to \$7.50 a barrel.

Q. And the price is often higher?

A. Probably.

Q. What is the freight on a barrel of apples to Winnipeg?

A. It would cost probably about 85 cents.

Q. So you can easily sell your apples for \$6?

A. Not at all. If you were to go into a store here and purchase a dozen lemons you would probably pay 40 cents a dozen for them.

Q. I am not talking about lemons, but about apples?

A. I am trying to make a comparison with the retail figures. I can go and purchase lemons for \$3 a case, but the retail price will be 30 or 40 cents a dozen. That is the difference between the wholesale and retail prices.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. You spoke about shipping 50 per cent of your higher grade apples to the west. How many barrels would that be?

A. That was for the five years.

Q. Do you mean 50 per cent every year or on the average?

A. No, I mean the average for the last five years. This year about twenty-five thousand barrels went to the Northwest.

Q. How much would it be every year?

A. It varies.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. You sell your apples to a dealer, you do not inquire where he sends them?

A. Not at all. We never inquire where he sends them.

Q. The dealer sends the apples to England, the Northwest or wherever he finds it suitable for his business?

A. That is true.

The next important part of the work of our association is settling with our growers after the apples have been packed. Now, it is only fair to those having Northern Spy apple trees that they get a better consideration for these apples than for Talman Sweets and other varieties. We all know that if we want a barrel of apples we generally want a barrel of Northern Spies, and that is the reason why we have pro-rated this variety of apples at a higher price. We find that this system of pro-rating has worked very nicely with our association and to the satisfaction of all. Land values have increased wonderfully in our county during the last few years. One orchard, the largest in the county, only a few years ago sold for \$4,500.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. How many acres?

A. 40 acres. In 1906, this orchard was sold for \$10,000.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. You mean the fruit in it?

A. The land and all. Last year this same orchard was sold for \$17,000.

By Mr. McCall:

Q. What is the probable value of it to-day?

A. That is a very hard question to answer.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Does that increase apply to land in apple trees only?

A. It has increased the value of the land without trees.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Am I correct in thinking that the land and all was sold for \$10,000?

A. Land and all was sold in 1906, for \$10,000 and last year for \$17,000—land and all.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. What year was it sold for the smaller amount?

A. The smaller amount was about the year 1901.

By Mr. McCall:

Q. What was the revenue of that orchard?

A. I cannot give you that.

I have here several accounts. The first gives my demonstration in an orchard which had never been known to produce over \$60 worth of apples.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. What kind of trees were planted there?

A. The orchard consists of 15 or 20 varieties. The first year, 1903, I gave this orchard exceptionally good care, sprayed it thoroughly, fertilized it, drained it, and after paying all the expenses of gathering the fruit it left in receipts \$1,192.70. The next year, 1904, I sold on the tree for \$650.

By Mr. McCall:

Q. How many acres are there in that orchard?

A. 250 to 300 trees. Now, in 1907, the net profit, after paying all expenses of the orchard, was \$885.04. These figures do not include the cider apples.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. That amounts to only a small sum?

A. It amounts to quite a considerable amount.

Q. How much would it be?

A. This year we received as high as 37½ cents per bushel.

Q. For windfalls?

A. That is right.

Q. That is a good deal more than we pay in our section.

A. Well, we cull our apples so close that the culls are very good. We try to make a good grade all the way through and get the top price.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. What was the average price per bushel?

A. Last year 70 cents, and two years ago 35 cents per 100 lbs.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. Are you speaking in reference to the crop of the members of the association?

A. Yes, I generally sell the apples. The members take them in and collect their pay.

By Mr. Lalor:

Q. Do you sell the culls to a canning factory?

A. Yes, to a canning factory and evaporating factories.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

By Mr. Burrell:

Q. The evaporating factory pays the same price?

A. Yes.

Now here is the account for the last few years in the same orchard. In 1908 profits were \$1,539.08, in 1909, \$1,890.51, and in 1910, \$1,532.60.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. Was the increased price in 1909 due to an improvement in the quality?

A. Yes. I have the accounts of several other orchards the same way. Take that of Robert Waddle. He received a cheque for \$1,572.96 in 1907. In 1908 the amount was much smaller, being only \$461.07. In 1909 Mr. Waddle received \$1,132.16; 1910, \$1,492.49. This grower lives a short distance from the town of Simcoe and has around 300 trees.

By Mr. Lalor:

Q. Can you give an idea of the net returns from the export of apples to the British market as compared with the sales in the Canadian Northwest?

A. The percentage?

Q. Yes.

A. In taking that up you see I have no wholesale figures. The apples for export are all sold at auction, and it would be very hard to check them up again.

Q. I do some exportation of apples myself, and the season before last our apples brought a much better price in the Northwest than in the British market.

A. If you had shipped your apples two years ago I am afraid you would have had a serious loss in the Northwest, because the apples sold in that country at that time at practically a loss.

Q. That was not my experience. I made money on it?

A. Did you ship early or late apples?

Q. I shipped late apples, Spies, Baldwins and Greenings.

A. As long as you can ship large quantities of Spies to the Northwest, they are always glad to buy them, but our percentage of Spies does not warrant that. We only ran this year approximately 15 per cent of Spies in our whole association.

Q. I come from the adjoining county where the percentage is not large.

A. What county?

Q. The county of Haldimand.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. You said that the grower of apples was a loser in the case of bad packing. Did any of your members lose anything last year?

A. Yes, they did.

Q. How much did they lose?

A. I could not give you the figures.

Q. Was it only a small percentage?

A. Very small. I think it ran in the neighbourhood of thirty or forty dollars altogether.

Q. Touching about how many members?

A. I think five.

By Mr. Lalor:

Q. It was purely the fault of the packer?

A. Yes.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. Was that loss determined by the inspectors' making a report on bad packing, or was it due to the returns after the fruit was sold?

A. It was due to complaints after the fruit was shipped. If we had caught the shipment in question, our inspectors would not have allowed them to go forward, because we are trying to do all we can to build up a reputation for our fruit. We want to grow a quality of fruit which we can ship to any market.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. You have said that Spies are superior to all other varieties. About what is the difference in value of Spies as compared with the lesser sought varieties?

A. We were this year offered \$4.25 for our Spies by an outside buyer, but we sold our whole pack for \$2.90.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. That is for numbers 1 and 2?

A. Yes, we had 5,400 odd barrels of Spies this year.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. Suppose one of your members had 500 barrels of Spies and another member had 500 barrels of other qualities. Do they both get \$2.90?

A. No. We pro-rata those apples.

Q. On what scale?

A. The scale would run from \$4 down to \$2 a barrel. We made up our minds not to take No. 2 falls, and still we got in fifty or sixty barrels, but we only allow them \$2 a barrel. They could have got just as much money by taking them to the evaporator. So you see they are kept down to very low prices. The case of No. 2's of Baldwins and such varieties, the pro-rata scale goes down from \$4 to \$2.35 or \$2.40 a barrel.

By Mr. Lalor:

Q. As the market turned out afterwards, those apples did not make a very good sale?

A. I consider we made a very good sale, bearing in mind the varieties we had. We cannot expect as apple producers to bleed the other fellow every year. We do it about four years out of every five, and this year it may look to you as though we have got probably too small a price, if so we will get our money back next year probably.

Q. If you had sold them yourself you would have got probably \$4 a barrel?

A. I was the party who sold them.

Q. If you had kept the apples and exported them yourself?

A. Yes, if our hind sight was as good as our fore sight we would do lots of things differently.

Q. You spoke of rented orchards. What is about the average price paid for a period of about five or ten years?

A. It is according to the bargain, from fifty cents to a dollar a tree.

By Hon. Mr. Fisher:

Q. It depends on the variety?

A. Certainly.

By Mr. Currie (Prince Edward):

Q. Is your trade mark registered?

A. It is not registered.

Q. Could not anybody else put that trade mark on their barrel at the present time?

A. I am not so sure they could. I do not see how anybody could put the trade-mark of the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association on a barrel.

Q. I think they could. I know of one man who built up a particular name after several years of work and another man came along and registered it, and his apples are bringing a very much higher price as a result.

STEPS NECESSARY IN THE FORMATION OF A FRUIT GROWERS ASSOCIATION.

The first necessary step in forming a fruit-growers' association is the establishment of Rules and Regulations for the management. It is essential that same rules will not work automatically in all sections. Therefore it is necessary to have rules according to conditions. The rules for the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association are as follows:—

1. This Association shall be known as the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association.
2. The objects of this Association shall be to encourage the Fruit Growers in the County of Norfolk who are interested in the improvement of the quality and quantity of Fruit, to co-operate for the purpose of securing a better and more uniform system of packing and marketing of their Fruits.
3. Any person in the County of Norfolk whose interests are in harmony with the fruit-growing industry and is recommended by the Executive Committee may become a member by paying to the Secretary-Treasurer the sum of One Dollar, on or before the First day of April in any year, and such payment shall entitle such person to all the rights and privileges of membership for the ensuing year.
4. Any member of the Association may withdraw at any time during the month of January, by giving notice in writing to the Secretary.
5. The Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held on the first Wednesday in March in each year, at such place as the Association may select. The business of the Annual Meeting shall be the receiving and disposing of the Auditor's Annual Report upon the business of the preceding year, the Annual election of officers and such other business as may be brought forward by the Executive Committee.
6. All elections shall be by ballot, plurality electing, and shall be conducted by two scrutineers appointed by the chairman.
7. At the Annual Meeting five members shall be elected as an Executive Committee who will have the general management of the Association in buying, selling and any other business of importance. At any meeting of the Executive Committee, three shall constitute a quorum, for the transaction of business. Two Auditors shall also be elected at the Annual Meeting who are not members of the Executive Committee.
8. Special meetings of the Association may be held at any time upon call of the President, by written notice mailed to each member at least five days before the meeting.
9. Special meetings shall also be called by the President whenever required to do so in writing, by one-fifth or more in numbers of the members of the Association.
10. At any meeting of the Association, 15% in number of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.
11. The officers of the Association shall consist of a President, a Vice-President, who shall be chosen by the Executive Committee from among themselves, at the first board meeting after the annual meeting. The Manager and Secretary-Treasurer may be chosen by the Executive Committee from among themselves. Special meetings of the Executive Committee may be held at such times and places as they may select.
12. The President, or in his absence, the Vice-President shall preside at all meetings of the Association. In the absence of both, a chairman shall be chosen from the members present.
13. The Manager and Secretary-Treasurer for the Association shall have charge of the business in detail, but cannot close any dealings unless authorized to do so by the Executive Committee.

APPENDIX No. 1

14. It shall be the duty of each member to prune and fertilize; he also shall spray three times each season with the formula, and at such times as recommended by the Manager of the Association.

15. All good barreling apples grown by members of the Association (excepting for their own use) are to be handled by the Executive Committee, and any member disposing of his or her own apples shall pay to the Association the sum of 50c. per barrel.

16. All Apples are to be packed in accordance with the grade adopted by the Executive Committee.

17. Each member shall pay for the head packer who is sent to his or her place to oversee and assist in the packing, while packing their fruit.

18. The books of the Association shall be audited before the date of the annual meeting in each year, and the report of the receipts and disbursements, properly signed, shall be read at such annual meeting. The members may order a special audit of the books to be made at any time and the auditor shall report thereon without unnecessary delay.

19. When from any cause a vacancy occurs in any of the offices of the Association, it shall be filled by the Executive Committee at their next meeting. Absence without leave from three consecutive meetings of the Executive Committee shall create a vacancy.

20. The Manager and Secretary-Treasurer shall be employed to look after the interests of the Members of the Norfolk Fruit Growers Association in getting quotations on barrels and spraying material; and show the members how to prune, spray, cultivate, fertilize, pick and pack their orchards to the best of their ability; also to give spraying and packing demonstrations.

He is also to look after the services of good packers and have one at each orchard while packing the fruit,—the expense of the packer to be paid by grower while packing at his or her place.

He also is to look up the best markets for selling the fruit. He agrees also to ship the fruit and look after collections, but cannot close any deal in buying, selling or dividing money, without consent of the majority of the Executive Committee. He also does the managing Secretary-Treasurer's work.

For this work the Executive Committee is to pay him twenty cents per barrel out of the proceeds of each member's apples.

21. Every dispute between members, and the Association, or any person claiming through or under a member, or under the rules of the Association, and the Executive Committee, Treasurer, or other officers thereof, shall be decided by arbitration in the manner following:—The party complaining shall make a statement in writing of the matter complained of or in dispute, and shall therein name the person he appoints as arbitrator, and shall place such statement in the hands of the Secretary of the Association. Within ten days of the receipt of such statement the President shall name a second arbitrator, unless he is a party to the dispute, in which case the Executive Committee will appoint the second arbitrator. The two arbitrators will meet and appoint a third arbitrator, and the arbitrators so appointed shall meet without unnecessary delay and hear and determine the matter in dispute, and file an award with the Secretary of the Association, which award if signed by at least two of the arbitrators, shall be binding and conclusive on all parties without appeal. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent both parties agreeing upon one arbitrator, whose decision in such case would be final. All arbitrators appointed under this section must be members of the Association.

22. The Secretary-Treasurer shall keep a record of the proceedings of all meetings of the Association, or its Executive Committee, and of all receipts and disbursements, and he shall report the condition of the finances annually, or as often as the Executive Committee shall desire. He shall also attend to the correspondence of the Association and keep the same on file.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

23. These rules may be amended at any regular or special meeting by a vote of the members present. Notice of any proposed amendment must be given each member by letter or otherwise at least five days previous to the meeting.

WHY CO-OPERATION IS NOT MORE SUCCESSFUL AMONG FARMERS.

The key to the great future success with our farmers lies in true systematic co-operation. It is just as necessary for farmers to join together for their mutual benefit as it is for any other body of people in the world, and nearly everybody else is working in co-operation with others of like occupation. It is necessary to organize, to have written by-laws, and to elect the most interested growers as officers of the organization. The best business manager obtainable should be engaged, the manager may not necessarily be one of the members.

It is regrettable that farmers' organizations up to the present time have not been more successful, and we must profit by the mistakes that have been made. There are several reasons why farmers' organizations have not been more successful, the chief of which I will explain to you.

(1) Because, as a class, farmers, up to the present time, have not learned the necessity of running their farms strictly upon business principles, as is customary for a business-man to run his business. The farmer's duty, as he sees it is to till the soil, grow and harvest the hay, grain and other products and take care of the stock, sell all above what he requires for his own use for cash, and with the cash purchase necessities and try to put aside a little cash each year in the bank. Usually he does not keep any other book than the bank pass book furnished to him by the bank. Business men, as a class, do not run their business in this way. They have learned that it is necessary to keep books, and in these books to have accounts of every branch of their business, so that they are able to determine their profits in each department. Some farmers keep accurate books for their farm. Such ones find it a pleasure to do their farming in this business-like way and are good organizers of farmers' co-operative associations, and if members were all of this type as far as the membership is concerned it would without a doubt be quite satisfactory.

(2) We should as farmers try and educate ourselves as to business methods, and we will then learn that farm books are necessary to insure success.

(3) Jealousy on the part of individual members, generally caused by suspicion.

(4) Farmers are more self-supporting than any other occupation, and this has given them considerable independence, but they have been accustomed to managing their own affairs, and not paying large profits, salaries or commissions to any one if they know it, and what are considered large profits by the farmers are looked upon as small profits by the business man. Therefore, when farmers go into business co-operatively very often they look for a manager who will work for the least money rather than one of experience. I know of several instances where men have accepted positions of manager of an association at a lower rate of commission or salary than he knew he could afford to take, but in order to get a Fruit Growers' Association started he accepted the position to the detriment of both association and himself. The manager soon finds that the fruit business is not one of pleasure and when he demands more pay there is always some one in the association who is willing to do it at the same old price, which causes a change in the management. A manager's position is a hard one, far harder than that of a general in an army, as the general only has his own army to look after, but the manager of a Fruit Growers' Association has his own army to look after also the enemy, as some farmers rather erroneously term the apple buyer. A successful manager will get the growers and the apple buyers upon a better understanding of each other, and make it a pleasure for them to do business with each other to their mutual benefit. Apple buyers and growers are both working at the present time to their disadvantage by not working co-operatively with one another.

APPENDIX No. 1

(5) The lack of education along co-operative lines, and the necessary experience in the purchasing of supplies, and the growing and the packing of the very best quality of apples.

(6) The packing of apples very often is very unsatisfactory. We should try as far as possible to have each member's apples packed in his presence, so that each can see for himself the quantity of No. 1, No. 2 and cull apples, that come out of his orchard.

(7) The farmers have been in the habit of receiving cash for their apples when delivered at the railway station, and they like to receive the cash soon after making delivery, so my advice would be to sell in the fall of the year at packing time and make contracts, so that you can settle with your growers as soon as possible.

(8) All apples should be pro-rated, according to varieties and classes, so that every grower will get his full value for his orchard. For instance, Northern Spy and Kings are worth more than Ben Davis or Pewaukees. It would well pay some of our co-operative associations to have their manager take a trip to Hood River, Oregon, or Grand Junction, Colorado, and visit the co-operative associations there and learn their business system of co-operatively handling their apples. Also visit the large receiving markets and learn what pack is most desirable. The reason co-operation is more successful in the Western States than it is here in the East is because the co-operative associations there are made up of members who are business and professional men.

(9) We do not give enough attention and consideration to our home markets.

(10) Each and every member and officer of the association should not only keep the printed by-laws of the association to the letter but should also enter into the true spirit of co-operation by keeping the following unwritten by-laws.

(a) The object of this association shall be bringing together several minds united in one idea.

(b) Speak kindly, be true and do right.

(c) All should agree to do all we can towards growing the very best apples and use as much care in the growing, packing and grading of our apples as do the California Co-operative Orange Growers' Associations in regard to their oranges.

(d) We are in this business for our mutual benefit. We, however, expect losses as well as gains, but we will stand together.

(e) Do unto others as you would like them to do unto you.

(f) We must not be selfish or have suspicion of one another, but everything that is done should be done for the good of the whole association and not for the good of any individual member.

The secret of success for every association will be in the quality of fruit produced and the packing of same, in the most careful manner in desirable packages. I will deal first with the uncared for orchards, owned by many members of our association, the first year they join.

Pruning is the first thought to be considered, which is generally done as early in the spring as possible and should be done in a most systematic way. Do not go to a thirty year old tree and prune same by cutting off a half dozen of the large limbs of the tree and call same pruned. Begin at the bottom of a tree by standing on a step ladder and work around the tree, thinning out the small branches with the saw and the hand pruning shears. It is quite necessary that the lower limbs are thinned quite severely the first year you prune a thirty year old uncared for orchard, then by the use of a 20 or 22 foot ladder thin out the balance of the small branches and be careful and not thin the top too severely where the 22 foot ladder will reach to the top, and if it does not reach to the top I would advise cutting back so you can reach any limb in the tree with a 22 foot ladder and paint all large wounds made in the top of the tree. Always use a fine tooth saw and do not leave any stubs, cutting close to the other limb where the wound is made, the limb left will carry the sap by the wound

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

causing a complete healing where the cut has been properly made. Always cut all dead wood out of the tree. A properly pruned tree renders spraying more effective.

Fertilizing.—It is just as necessary that a tree should be properly fed to produce fruit as it is to feed an animal to produce fat. Barnyard manure has been used more extensively than any other fertilizer, which should be put on in the winter or the early spring. We have a lot to learn as to the value of commercial fertilizers.

Cultivation.—Ploughing should be done as early in the spring as possible, not when the owner is ready, but as soon as the frost will permit, and the working of the soil should follow, and continued in Southern Ontario until 10th to 15th of June. The date to stop cultivation will depend on climatic conditions and location. The aim should be to cultivate to a period that will bring the harvest with matured fruit in plenty of time before severe freezing weather.

Cover crop.—This again depends on location. In Southern Ontario I would recommend the sowing of half a bushel of buckwheat to the acre at the time of the last cultivation. Constant sowing of clover crop is apt to make poor coloured fruit.

Spraying.—No part of the care for orchard work is more unsettled than that of spraying. This is especially due to the large number of manufacturers who are preparing spray mixtures, all of whom have according to their advertisements the *best*. My opinion is that both the growers and the manufacturers will all see nearer alike within the next five years.

SPRAYS FOR APPLE TREES.

The members of the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association will for 1911 principally all use the following spray card for apples:—

First spray when buds begin to swell with lime sulphur 32 degrees baume or 1.2831 specific gravity. Test and dilute to 8 parts water and one part concentrated lime sulphur. In diluting, when trees are dormant divide the baume test by four.

The growers who wish to prepare their own concentrated lime sulphur should write to L. Caesar, B.A., B.S.A., Department of Entomology, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

Second spraying.—Just before fruit buds break open, with bordeaux mixture, consisting of 16 lbs. blue vitriol, 1 lb. paris green, 12 oz. white arsenic and 2½ lbs. sal soda (prepared as below) 70 lbs. lime, 200 gallons water.

Third spraying.—(Very important.) Just as quickly as blossoms fall, with 12 lbs. blue vitriol, 1 lb. paris green, 12 oz. white arsenic 2½ lbs. sal soda (prepared as below) 70 lbs. lime 200 gallons water.

Fourth spraying.—If troubled with Tussock Moth, when the young begin to feed on the new foliage, with same formula as third spray.

Always use 10 lbs. water to the gallon. We also prefer to use granular blue vitriol, as it dissolves easier. Also get a high grade lime.

Always prepare the arsenic by boiling 12 ozs. arsenic with 2½ lbs. sal soda in 2 gallons water for 45 minutes; if you have a kettle large enough you can make up a stock solution. Keep this kettle away from stock as it is poison. Also, do not boil where stock may be running, as if any boils over on the ground, the stock will eat the earth and it will poison them.

We will now make up 200 gallons for 2nd spraying; Put 16 lbs vitriol in a hopper with Burlap bottom, which place over the hole in your tank, pump or pour 150 gallons of water on this vitriol straining in the tank. Then slack 70 lbs. good lump lime (none air-slacked) in 50 gallons of water and strain through a hopper with a wire bottom into 150 gallons already in the tank. Then add of your boiled arsenic solution an amount equivalent to 12 ozs. White Arsenic and 2½ lbs. sal soda. Then add one pound paris green by dissolving in a small pail of water. Each time in adding lime

APPENDIX No. 1

arsenic and paris green agitate thoroughly. Now you are ready for the orchard and keep well agitated and a good pressure. Always clean out lime box with water every time after using. Always pump some clean water through your pump, nozzles, &c., every night when in use and keep tank well cleaned out.

A great many of our orchardists in Ontario will this year use concentrated lime sulphur and arsenate of lead for second, third and fourth spraying. Good result was obtained last year by using this formula, prepared as follows:—With foliage on the tree concentrated lime sulphur giving a 32 degree Baume test dilute 32 part water and 1 part concentrated lime sulphur, adding 3 lbs. of arsenate of lead to each 50 gallons of the mixture. Some also add five pounds lime to 50 gallons of mixture. If Baume test is 33 dilute 33 parts water 1 part lime sulphur. In other words divide Baume test by one when the trees are in leaf. It is very necessary that you have a hydrometer showing that Baume and specific gravity test if you use lime sulphur.

Thinning of apples.—This should begin not later than the last week in July. All heavy loaded trees should certainly be thinned and the better the thinning is done, the better will be the quality and better the price: besides, it is not such a heavy burden on the tree. A small apple has just as many seeds as a large apple, and it is the seeds in the apple that take the large amount of plant food.

THE CARE OF A YOUNG APPLE ORCHARD.

First: Location and soil.—A good orchard soil possesses at least three strong characteristics: good water drainage; good texture and plenty of plant food.

Preparation of the soil.—Before starting to plant, the soil should be deeply ploughed and thoroughly cultivated.

Purchasing of Nursery Stock.—Other things being equal, it is best to buy from the nearest nursery as the stock is usually acclimated and better adapted to the location than stock grown under different conditions. Buy only the very best from reliable nurserymen; second class stock and culls are dear at any price and should never be planted; diseased, stunted or injured trees rarely if ever develop into a first-class tree.

Distance apart to set.—33 feet apart is customary in Southern Ontario for winter varieties of apples. My own orchard is planted for permanent varieties 40 feet apart, and in the centre of each square is a filler apple tree giving 54 apple trees to the acre, and then I have a peach tree placed between each apple tree, giving me 54 peach trees to the acre. The marking of your orchard is best done, if your field is fairly level, by the use of a No. 12 galvanized iron wire; first with a square, two boards and stakes; square your field then stretch your wire with even pressure with stakes at each end, drive slanting or pulley and block across the field, then get a coil of small brass wire and wire pinchers. If you are planting your trees 33 feet apart, wind firmly around the No. 12 galvanized wire at about 12 feet from the end four or five rounds of this small brass wire, pinch down firmly and put on some white lead so it will not slip. Repeat this every 33 feet across the field (use a steel tape or measuring stock for measuring), leave two or three days to dry well, then place a few cross sticks over this wire so it will not get out of line, and you are ready for the digging of the holes, so the wire knot will come in the centre of each hole, then place your tree so the trunk is against the knot, slant the tree to the west (owing to prevailing winds) and work rich top soil well around the roots and tramp in firmly. Always prune all bruised roots, leaving a smooth cut. Now you are ready to prune the tree.

The building of an apple tree should begin when the tree is first set. Give the tree the proper shape you want it to grow and cut back at least one third of all branches. All trees should be pruned each year, in order to shape them properly and not grow any waste wood. It is also necessary that these trees should be sprayed each year while the trees are dormant, with lime sulphur.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

I have had good results in growing strawberries and potatoes between my trees. Many of my three year old filler peach trees last season produced one bushel of peaches. I also marketed 98,000 baskets of strawberries and 4,000 bushels of potatoes last season, grown between my trees.

Many old and neglected orchards can by systematic and well directed work be gotten into good condition, but they can never be made to acquire as high a standard of excellence as if they had been well cared for throughout their entire period of development.

Every individual tree requires treatment differing from that of its neighbour. This difference, however, is of no consequence to the experienced pruner, as he knows how much each should be treated. The Northern Spy required more pruning than the Baldwin or Greening, and the King requires very little.

THE CHAIRMAN.—The work that has been done by the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association has been of such practical value, and of such great value, that it is too bad that the country at large is not in possession of all that has been accomplished. If this information is spread broadcast throughout the land, the practical results that have been obtained—and the evidence we have listened to this morning confirms that idea—would be extended. If we could distribute this information to the public generally it would prove of great value to the apple industry. The Government sent demonstrators to the County of Oxford some five or six years ago to do experimental work in spraying, and as a result of that work an association has been started at Burgessville, which is doing work to this day, while there is another association at Hatchley which is doing excellent work. Then there is Mr. J. C. Harris at Ingersoll who started spraying ten or fifteen years ago, and I had him attend Farmers' Institute meetings to tell them what he was doing. The farmers were skeptical and very few had faith in what he was accomplishing. But he is running orchards and carrying on the business in a much larger way than ever. Now, the work Mr. Johnson's Association is doing is perhaps larger and more outstanding than the work of those other associations. It is a work along the line of practical demonstration to the farmers of this country. I think we would have the difficulties of inspection almost entirely solved, if we could get a high grade quality of fruit.

I have very much pleasure in tendering you, Mr. Johnson, the thanks of this committee for your attendance before us.

Mr. JOHNSON.—I only wish to thank you for this most hearty vote of thanks. Committee adjourned.

Certified correct,

JAS. E. JOHNSON.

COLD STORAGE FOR APPLES AND OTHER FRUITS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

COMMITTEE ROOM, No. 34,

WEDNESDAY, March 8, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Schell, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN.—You have noticed from the Order Paper that Mr. J. A. Ruddick, Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner, Department of Agriculture, will address us this morning on 'Cold Storage for Apples and other Fruit; The results of some experiments and trial shipments.' Cold storage is one of the questions that is agitating the mind of the public perhaps more to-day than ever, and we are glad that Mr. Ruddick will have some valuable information to give us in the matter of caring for fruit in cold storage. I believe he has some samples of fruit here and by means of it will be able to convey some idea of the benefits that have resulted from caring for fruit in cold storage. I have very great pleasure in now calling upon Mr. Ruddick to address you.

Mr. J. A. RUDDICK.—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen:—The Branch of the Department of Agriculture over which I have charge covers several different lines of work, but I am here this morning, as you understand, to give you some evidence as to what we have been doing in relation to the cold storage of fruit. We have been getting some experience along that line during recent years and in various ways: In the first place we have, through our system of refrigerator car and cargo inspection, and the supervision of the export of fruit in cold storage, a succession of reports from Montreal and ports in Great Britain respecting the condition of fruit arriving under different systems of transportation. We are able to draw some conclusions from these records. We have also been conducting some commercial experiments—I would call them that rather than scientific experiments—in the cold storage of apples and some other fruits, and these I shall bring to your notice later on.

APPLES FOR INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS.

During the last three or four years it has fallen to my lot to make the collections of apples for the various International Exhibitions at which Canada has been represented. We buy the apples in the fall and keep them in cold storage, and we know by the way in which they turn out during the following summer, as to what varieties give the best results in cold storage, and the effect of different kinds of treatment on the keeping of apples. Some of these points I expect to bring out in the course of my evidence.

I would ask your permission then to present this subject to you in the following order: First, the cold storage of apples; second, the cold storage of grapes; and third, the result of some trial shipments of peaches to Great Britain.

By Mr. Owen:

Q. Will you tell us at what temperature you keep your cold storage for apples?

A. Yes, I will give that information later if I may.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

THE COLD STORAGE OF APPLES.

Now, cold storage may be applied to the apple industry in two or three ways: In the first place it is useful for the cooling of the early varieties for immediate shipment. Then it is also useful for the preservation of the later or winter varieties which may be kept for several months; and it has a further use in extending the season for certain special varieties. The earliest varieties are not wanted for long keeping; it is not advisable to try to keep them.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Will you tell us in your address how long apples can be kept?

A. Yes, I will do that. It is inadvisable to try to keep the earliest varieties into the season for other later and superior varieties. Then it is important to get the apples out promptly to secure the early market. These early apples ripen rapidly; that is the reason they are early apples, because their life processes are short and proceed much more rapidly than in the later varieties. That means that the early variety ripens as much in a day as some of the later varieties will in a week or even a fortnight, and perhaps even more than that. A day or even a few hours at high temperature makes a great difference. It is of the very greatest advantage then to be able to chill these early apples before shipment. They will carry very much better, because being firmer and harder when chilled they do not bruise so readily, and they will reach the consumer in much better condition and with less waste. That is the only way in which we need cold storage for apples of this class.

BOXES VS. BARRELS IN COLD STORAGE.

Then the box or the package is of some importance in this connection, because apples packed in boxes may be cooled very much more quickly than if they are put in barrels. If you pack apples in barrels during warm weather when the ripening process is proceeding rapidly there is a great deal of heat generated in the apple itself, and in a tight package like a barrel the heat is confined. The high temperature continues the ripening process and the ripening process generates more heat and the apples deteriorate very rapidly under those conditions. But in a box which is more or less open, the heat escapes, the cooling is effected more rapidly, and there is not the same amount of deterioration in a given time. I have seen experiments reported with early varieties of apples that had been placed in a constant temperature for several days and then when a thermometer was pushed into one of those apples the temperature was found to be as much as two degrees higher than the constant temperature in which they are stored. That is the heat generated by the ripening processes. Chemists tell us that they can by analysis determine exactly how many heat units have been generated in the ripening process.

By Mr. Best:

Q. Will you tell us if there is much difference in the flavour of an apple that is fairly ripe and one that is picked a little green?

A. Generally speaking the more matured apple has the better flavour, and there is this to be said: that the fairly well matured apple, which of course is not over-ripe, will keep longer and better in cold storage than a green one will. That I know is contrary to the opinion that is held by a great many people. An apple ripens more rapidly after it is picked than it does on the tree.

Q. Will that apply to all kinds of apples?

A. To all kinds of apples.

Q. And to all kinds of fruit?

A. Yes, up to a certain stage. Of course you must not allow the fruit to get over-ripe.

APPENDIX No. 1

THE IMPORTANCE OF QUICK COOLING.

Now, I want to give you one illustration as to the advantage of the quick cooling of these early varieties. You have all heard of the famous Gravenstein apple as grown in Nova Scotia. It grows, of course, in other districts of Canada, but it grows particularly well in some parts of Nova Scotia, and I think the reputation of Nova Scotian apples has been made as much by the Gravenstein as by any other. In 1909 a very large percentage of the Gravenstein apples arrived on the market in a wasty, unsatisfactory condition. It was warm weather at the time of packing, and there were other peculiarities of the season which contributed to the condition in which they arrived on the market. They were put in barrels in a fast ripening condition and shipped to the Old Country and to other markets, and arrived very much out of condition, and there was a great deal of loss as a result. Last fall, as a part of a representative exhibit from the different provinces at the National Apple Show which was held at Vancouver, I arranged with some of the fruit growers in Nova Scotia to prepare some half dozen boxes of Gravensteins, along with other varieties, and send them to Ottawa as soon as they were picked. They were then put in cold storage here and shipped to Vancouver on the 22nd of October by express, just in an ordinary express car, which was warm of course. Those apples were on exhibition in Vancouver until the 5th of November when they were returned to Ottawa. They were in good condition for three weeks after they reached this city. Every apple in the box was sound and in good condition. That was a very much more severe test than they are subjected to when placed on the market in the ordinary way, and shows the value of prompt cooling. Provision for cooling the Gravenstein, as well as other choice early varieties, would add greatly to the profits in growing or handling them, and tend to still further enhance their reputation.

Now as to the cold storage for later varieties. If I were asked why I think cold storage is useful in handling late fall or winter varieties I would put the case something like this: A large percentage of all apples become more or less wasty and over-ripe before they reach the consumer. Now, that is partly the result of injuries which the apples receive in the picking and handling, and it is partly because they are held for a few weeks at too high a temperature. Even our latest varieties are exposed to temperatures which are not sufficiently low to check these life processes in time, and in consequence a large percentage of the apples become over-ripe and wasty before they reach the limit of their season—the season that they may be expected to be good in.

COLD STORAGE WILL NOT PREVENT ALL WASTE.

Cold storage will not prevent all this waste, not by any means, and I do not want any one to get that impression from anything I may say, because I think there is really as much room for improvement in the handling of apples so as to prevent bruises and skin punctures of one kind and another, as there is in the application of cold storage. If you have your apples perfect, sound in the skin, with no bruises and no punctures of any kind so that the moulds cannot find entrance, winter varieties will keep a long time even without cold storage; but with the aid of cold storage you can extend their season, and those which are not quite so perfect will be preserved in better condition. We notice that apples keep very much better some seasons than they do in others. I am speaking now of the winter varieties. In 1909 it was found that the Northern Spy, which is one of our prominent varieties, as you know, kept very badly, it turned out badly early in the season. There was reason for that and I think it was simply this: that at the time of harvesting and after the apples were packed, while they were still in the barrels lying round, the weather was unusually warm, and that meant of course that there was a very rapid deterioration. Now, if these apples could have been chilled, and without any delay, at the time they were harvested, it would have meant a considerable saving to the apple growers and

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

dealers, many of whom suffered great losses in that year, and the warm weather would have been an advantage rather than a detriment.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Could the farmer do that?

A. Of course he could.

Q. It is not easy for the individual farmer to provide himself with a good cold storage warehouse.

A. No, but it is quite possible for the individual fruit grower to have small ice storages. If I were a fruit grower or was handling apples or tender fruits, I should certainly provide a place of that kind. Of course I think the ideal way would be to have these apples removed at once from the orchards to the cold storage warehouses. In the state of New York—where they need cold storage a little more than we do because their season is somewhat earlier in some districts—along the Falls Branch of the New York Central Railroad from the Bridge to Rochester, you will find every little village has one or more big cold storage warehouses for apples. The fruit is taken right from the orchards into these places and stored there. These apples are mostly for the home trade and they are kept in storage until they are required.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. The only effectual way to handle apples would be to reduce them to the right temperature before they are placed in the barrel?

A. I do not think it is not practicable to do that.

Q. There is heat in the barrels and the cooling would occupy some considerable time.

A. Not if the temperature is low enough. However, as I have already said, apples will cool very much quicker in boxes than they will in barrels, because the box is open and the air circulates very much more freely in a box than it does in a barrel. That is why tender early ripening varieties should be put in boxes as much as possible.

By Mr. Donnelly:

Q. Who erects and controls the cold storage warehouses that you spoke of in the state of New York?

A. I think they are mostly controlled by large firms who are dealing in apples, but there are quite a number of public cold storages.

Q. Those cold storages would be operated by private individuals and charges made for fruit placed therein?

A. Yes. The usual charge there is 40 cents a barrel, for the season, irrespective of the length of the storage period. The storages are operated only during the apple season.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Do they use ice?

A. No, they have mechanical refrigeration in these places.

VENTILATION OF BARRELS.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. Would it be an advantage or a disadvantage to secure free circulation of air by having openings in the barrel?

A. That is a point which is very much discussed and there is something to be said on both sides. It would certainly facilitate the cooling of the apples in the barrel to have the barrel ventilated by making openings in it. That would be an advantage from the point of view of rapid cooling. On the other hand, when you

APPENDIX No. 1

take apples out of the cold storage into a warmer atmosphere it would be an advantage to have the package perfectly air tight, which prevents the air from coming into contact with the cooled fruit, and stops that condensation of moisture which takes place when there is a free circulation of air round it. On the whole I think the ordinary barrel will give the best satisfaction if put into cold storage as quickly as possible. Now, understand me, I would not advocate that all the apples grown in Canada should go into cold storage, that is not the intention at all, but it is necessary for those who want to keep a stock for late consumption, or to extend the season for special varieties. Now, while we are speaking of the storage of Northern Spies, I want to show you something which may be of some interest.

APPLES GROWN IN 1909.

These (exhibiting specimens) are not particularly fancy specimens of the Northern Spy, they are not very large, there is nothing special about them, but they are taken out of a commercial box which was grown in 1909 and are now 17 months old. They are taken from a lot of fruit placed in cold storage at London, within about 48 hours after being packed, and kept there at a temperature of about 32 degrees until last spring, and since that time they have been kept at 30 degrees.

By Mr. Owen:

Q. Do you vary the temperature for early and late varieties?

A. No, the lowest possible temperature without freezing the apples is the best. Of course if you are cooling apples for immediate shipment I would not advocate as low a temperature as that, because you would have some trouble with the moisture condensing on them when you take them out. A temperature of between 40 and 50 degrees is sufficient to check the ripening of the early apples. That will make a great improvement as compared with 70 and sometimes 80 degrees, as often prevails during the harvesting.

Now these apples (referring to 1909 Spies) are perfect in appearance, and you can see they are quite firm and crisp though nearly a year and a half old. There was some waste in the box, but in every case the rotten apple had received some injury.

Q. At what temperature were these apples kept in storage?

A. At 32 for the first 6 months, and after that at 30 degrees.

Q. They would have kept just as well at 32 as they did at 30?

A. No, I think 30 is the better temperature, but it requires great care to operate with such a narrow margin of safety. I want to call your attention to this point for long keeping. You will notice that the specimens I have handed around are fairly well coloured and well matured. Now, here is a specimen (showing apple) which was poorly coloured when picked. You see it is now of a brown russet colour, or what is known as 'scalded.' This defect is much more common when the apples are immature or poorly coloured.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. The apples are not as good flavoured as others that have not been kept so long, are they?

A. The flavour of these 1909 apples is slightly musty, and it is not as good as it was a year ago. There were a few apples in the box that were rotten. The Northern Spy is particularly susceptible to the brown rot, which is caused by the growth of blue mould. If the skin is perfect the mould cannot do any harm, but if there is a break or a bruise, the mould enters and the apple decays. If you have it in perfect condition there are few apples that will keep better than the Spy.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

IMPORTANCE OF PROMPT STORAGE.

I want to give a little further emphasis to one point in connection with these experiments. Seven carloads of apples were purchased in the fall of 1909. One carload was grown in the county of Elgin, in Southern Ontario, and the others were procured in Ontario county. The Elgin county lot was placed in cold storage at London within three days after the apples were picked, the other lots were cold stored at Montreal and St. John, N.B., with the exception of one carload, which was stored in a frost proof warehouse at Oshawa. The Northern Spy apples which are shown here to-day are from a box belonging to the lot stored at London, and I would say that this box of apples is in nearly as good condition to-day as the Oshawa lots were a year ago. I attribute the difference partly to the fact that the Southern Ontario apples were more mature and better coloured, but the difference in the keeping quality was mostly due to the fact that the lots stored at Montreal and St. John were delayed for nearly three weeks from the time of packing until they were placed in cold storage. There was some difficulty about obtaining cars for shipment. I consider that these experiments would be worth while, if they did nothing else than to emphasize this point. I find it difficult to impress upon fruit growers and dealers the necessity of getting fruit into cool storage quickly.

When collecting apples for exhibition purposes I have had our packers send the boxes to cold storage every night, and where no cold storage was available, and the apples were to be shipped from the point where they were packed, we have ordered a refrigerator car, in which the boxes were placed as fast as the packing was finished. By keeping the car well iced the apples are soon cooled off.

APPLES FOR FESTIVAL OF EMPIRE.

We have on hand now about 1,200 boxes of apples comprising 26 varieties collected from all over Canada, which are intended for the Festival of the Empire Exhibition, which is to be held in London next summer. I think these are the finest lot of apples we have ever put up, and they should do the country a great deal of credit.

EXTENDING THE SEASON FOR CHOICE VARIETIES.

Now there is another important function of cold storage in connection with the apple trade, that is to extend the season for special varieties, and in this connection I will mention only four varieties, the Fameuse, the McIntosh Red and the Gravenstein—three of the finest dessert apples in the world, without any question—and another very choice apple, namely, the Greening, which is particularly an Ontario apple. Now the Greening is one of the most useful varieties grown in Canada. It is not very attractive in appearance and it is not popular in some markets on account of its rather dull green colour, but it is an excellent cooking apple and it is also a good dessert apple. There is no apple for which the season has been extended so successfully as in the case of the Greening. This has been demonstrated very fully in New York and other eastern states, where they have extended its season two and three months with success in every respect. You cannot do that safely with many varieties, which lack some peculiar quality to make them popular. Greening has quality which carries it in competition with the other varieties at any time. It should be well matured, showing a slight blush, otherwise it is apt to scald. The usual season for the Greening is December to February. In this lot of apples, cold stored in 1909, there were some 200 boxes of Greenings which were shipped to Calgary, and they gave the best of satisfaction in the month of May.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. Were they packed in boxes from the time they were picked off the trees?

A. Yes.

Q. They never were in barrels?

A. No, and they were not re-packed either.

RE-PACKING NOT NECESSARY.

That is a point which we must not overlook. It is the common practice when apples are to be held for winter shipment to pack them temporarily, in the orchards, and to re-pack in the warehouse just before shipment. The re-packing can be saved if the apples are cold stored and more care is given to the original packing. We did not find it necessary to re-pack any of these cold storage apples. A thin pad or liner was put under the head of each barrel before final shipment.

Q. A paper liner?

A. There were two layers of paper with a little excelsior between, which made the pad about a quarter of an inch thick.

By Mr. Owen:

Q. You supervised the packing of them yourself?

A. No, not in all cases; in some cases we had men on the spot but in other cases we merely specified they should be well packed.

Q. They were packed a little better than ordinarily?

A. Undoubtedly, because when they are packing with the intention of re-packing they are not very careful. The result of re-packing these matured apples, because they are usually quite matured at that time, is that every apple is bruised more or less, in the operation, and when they are turned out in the old country, or anywhere else, you can hardly find one that is not so injured; that detracts from the appearance and the value in every way. If the cost of re-packing can be saved and the apples preserved in better condition it seems to be worth while.

APPLES SHOULD BE WRAPPED IN PAPER.

Q. Do you wrap each apple?

A. We wrapped the apples that were put in boxes and that is advisable, too, not only for the appearance, but paper helps to keep them tight. If an odd apple rots the wrapper confines the spores of the mould to some extent, at least, so that the others are not so much affected as they would be if unwrapped.

Q. Do you put pressure on the apples when packing?

A. Just enough to keep them snug, that is all, not enough to bruise the apple.

MCINTOSH RED AND FAMEUSE.

Now, I spoke of the McIntosh Red and the Fameuse, and I have some of those varieties here. I want to show you a Fameuse (exhibiting specimen) which is now two months past its regular season, but still in fine condition.

Q. Is this an 1909 apple?

A. Oh, no, that is last fall apple. Here is another specimen. Some of these are from Ontario and some from Quebec.

By Mr. Savoie:

Q. What apple is this?

A. Fameuse.

Q. Of last fall's growth?

A. Yes, last fall, it came from down near Como, I think

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

These (exhibiting specimens) are the McIntosh Red. They are firm and crisp and will be in good condition for a long time yet, although fully a month or six weeks past their regular season. There is no difficulty at all about preserving these choice dessert apples all through the winter, although they are usually done in the months of December and January.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. What is it you call this apple, we would call it a Snow apple?

A. That is the Fameuse.

Q. They would pass for a Snow apple with us.

A. It is a different name for the same apple. It is called Snow in Ontario, and Fameuse in Quebec where it originated.

APPLES DAMAGED IN THE ORCHARDS AFTER PACKING.

By Mr. Best:

Q. Is it not a fact that a great many apples are spoilt in the orchards by being allowed to lie there too long?

A. Yes, there is no doubt about that.

Q. It is quite easy to have them covered and protected from the sun instead of allowing them to be exposed to it?

A. That would be an advantage.

Q. I have found that the apples on one side of the barrel would be very much more ripened than the other, and that it was owing to that side being exposed to the sun.

A. Very probably.

By Mr. Owen:

Q. What effect would the rain have on the apples when lying exposed in the orchard?

A. I do not think dampness or moisture would have any detrimental effect, unless it would be to encourage the growth of mould inside the packages.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. Who is responsible for the delay in getting the apples out of the orchard?

A. I do not blame the delay on any one in particular, because I understand that under our present system of marketing a great deal of it has been unavoidable.

Q. I have seen the apples lying for four weeks in the orchards after having been put in the barrels.

A. Apples allowed to lie in that way will certainly deteriorate more than those which are put into a cool warehouse, there is no doubt about that.

COLD STORAGE FOR GRAPES.

Now, with regard to the grape industry, those of you who know anything about fruit growing in the Niagara District know that the grape is one of the most reliable crops that the fruit grower has. It is never a very big money maker, but it is reliable and it is a very important crop. A very large crop of grapes usually results under present conditions in a glutted market, as there was in 1909. Now, I believe that some special varieties, some of those which have good firm skins can be held in cold storage for several months, and the season for grapes can thereby be extended very considerably. One reason why I make that statement is because I have here a basket of grapes grown last fall, which, as you can see, although they are past their best, are still in good condition. This is just a commercial basket taken from a lot of 25 baskets. I simply ordered them by letter from one of the growers, and had

APPENDIX No. 1

them shipped to the London cold storage where they were placed in a temperature of 37°, at which they have been held ever since. It is only a preliminary experiment, because there are a good many things we have yet to learn about the cold storage of grapes; we are not sure what is the best temperature at which to keep them or how the grapes should be handled before they are put in cold storage. We have yet many things to learn in this connection. You may find on testing them that some of these grapes are a little off in flavour.

By Mr. Owen:

Q. They taste very good; what variety are they?

A. One of the Rogers Hybrids, I think it is No. 4, known as the Wilder.

Q. How long have they been in cold storage?

A. Since October. I hope that in another year, with the completion of the cold storage warehouse in Hamilton, we will have some facilities for carrying on extensive experiments in connection with the storage of these more tender fruits, which have to be put into store very promptly after they are harvested. The specimens which I have here, you understand, had to be shipped to London, and while they have been very accommodating there in giving me every facility they have, they are not specially equipped for experimental work. I hope to be able to do something more on that line; I think it will be quite possible to keep many of these firmer varieties of grapes throughout the winter. You can easily see if that can be done how it will extend the market and relieve the glut at the time they are harvested.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. Before you leave the grape question, I would like to call your attention to this very fine bunch of grapes which you have handed around for inspection. It is true that it is not perhaps quite as large or as nice in appearance as those we see imported from Great Britain and sold at 90 cents per pound or \$2 a bunch. I would like to ask you whether any effort has been made to substitute Canadian grapes of the fine quality you have exhibited here to-day for those imported from the old country, or to substitute them for the California grape which comes into the Canadian market packed in sawdust all the winter? I think something might be done in that direction as it is rather a pity that the people of Canada are paying away their money for these hot house grapes, giving tenfold for them what they would pay for the Canadian grape.

A. I do not think the Canadian grown grape will compete very well with the hot-house grape which is imported from Great Britain, and which is really in a different class altogether. You know that English people will hardly eat our grapes.

Q. On the other hand, do not our Canadian people cultivate a taste for the English grape, have they not to cultivate a taste for them before they like them?

A. I did not have to cultivate a taste for them, I never had any difficulty at all in that regard.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. The hothouse grape can be grown in this country, can it not?

A. Oh yes, there would be no trouble about that.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. I notice that each bunch has attached to it a small section of the wood, does that cause any injury to the vine?

A. No, it will be pruned off in any case, and it is quite an advantage to leave a bit of the vine attached to each branch, because they do not dry out so much.

By Mr. Best:

Q. Would these grapes keep as well in an ice warehouse as in a mechanical refrigerator?

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

A. It is all a question of temperature, but I do not think the temperature with ice storage can be made low enough to keep them that length of time. Of course, we do not know what is the best temperature for keeping grapes. There has been very little work done in the cold storage of grapes. If I had the facilities, I would be able to determine the different temperatures under different conditions.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. If to a moderate extent our grapes could be made a substitute for the imported grapes at dinners at this season of the year it would be an advantage?

A. I do not see any reason why these grapes, if properly put away and kept should not be used for that purpose to some extent. No doubt they would not take the place altogether of the imported grapes, but they might do so to a considerable extent. I believe there is an opportunity to improve the grape industry along this line.

By Mr. Owen:

Q. In what temperature were these kept?

A. These grapes were kept in a temperature of 37°.

TRIAL SHIPMENTS OF PEACHES.

Coming to the peach shipments, we have to deal not so much with a question of cold storage as with one of packing and handling. At the same time, the peaches could never be exported without cold storage. In 1897 the Department of Agriculture undertook to make shipments of tender fruits to Great Britain, and shipped altogether seven thousand cases, including about 1,400 cases of peaches.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. In what year?

A. In 1897. They were packed in large cases and the conditions were not as good as they might have been in some respects, with the result that the shipments were not altogether a success. Some landed in good condition, but a good many did not. However, I have no personal knowledge of these shipments, as I was not with the department at the time.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Have you not tried it since that time?

A. I am coming to that. Since then we have shipped small lots of peaches to the different exhibitions—to the Franco-British Exhibition, and to some others which have been held in recent years—and they were landed in good condition and attracted considerable attention. During the last two or three years, the peach growers have been extending their acreage very rapidly, and they have come to realize that it would be necessary for them, in the very near future, to find a new market for a considerable quantity of peaches. It seemed to be advisable that some effort should be made to thoroughly test this matter of shipping peaches to Great Britain, and the minister authorized me to make some trial shipments. We took the matter up early in the season, corresponded with brokers on the other side, and with our own representatives, the Cargo Inspectors, with a view to deciding on the best style of package, and of determining as nearly as possible how many peaches it would be safe to send during the season. The result was that we made arrangements with the St. Catharines Cold Storage and Forwarding Company, Limited—because they had the only cold storage facilities in the Niagara District—to supply us with 2,000 cases of peaches to be packed as we directed, and they were packed like this (showing sample case). There were 20 or 23 peaches in each case, packed in aspen wood wool, which comes from Norway, and fills the bill to perfection.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. Is that package tight at the bottom?

A. No, it is slightly open at the edges. The top and bottom are a little narrow.

PRICE GUARANTEED TO GROWERS.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. In buying that quantity what did you pay?

A. I arranged to pay the growers the local market price at the canning factories, about $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, plus the cost of the package and the packing.

Q. What would they sell for in England?

A. They sold at an average of \$1.04 per case.

Q. What would that be per pound?

A. About 17 cents. They netted the growers at St. Catharines 80.7 cents per case, or about $13\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. I take some pride in the fact that we handled these peaches without costing the department a cent and gave the growers three times as much as we promised.

By Mr. Best:

Q. They sold at an average of what?

A. They sold at a price which varied from 3s. 6d. to 6s. 6d. per case, or on an average in our currency of \$1.04 per case.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. That would be about four cents each? What did they retail for?

A. Six pence to eight pence, and in a few cases at one shilling each as English hothouse grown. The cost of shipping these peaches from St. Catharines to London, Liverpool and other markets was 23.3 cents per case. The freight from St. Catharines to Montreal was 4 cents per case and the ocean freight 9.6 cents, while the selling charges in Great Britain, including commission, were 9.7 cents per case, making a total of 23.3 cents per case, leaving an average net return f.o.b. cars St. Catharines of 80.7 cents per case. I may say, to judge from some of the account sales, that a few of these cases were used for advertising purposes, and there was consequently no return for them, but this is the net return for all the peaches shipped.

Q. That happens to be a cent per peach for transportation, commission and expenses?

A. Yes. Now, I want to make another reference to the shipments made in 1897, and to explain the difference between the results in the two years.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. I suppose these went in ordinary cold storage?

A. They were shipped from St. Catharines in refrigerator cars and put in cold storage chambers on the ship at a temperature of about 36 degrees, and the temperature was allowed to rise a few hours before the chamber was opened, so as to prevent any condensation of moisture, which occurs after the sudden transfer from a low to a high temperature.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. After their arrival in England were they treated in the same way as ordinary shipments?

A. The shipments to London were taken to Convent Garden and sold at private sale by George Monro & Sons, Ltd., the shipments to Liverpool were sold under the hammer, and also, I think, in Manchester, where we sent a small lot. The shipments to Glasgow and other points were all sold at private sale.

By Mr. Russell:

Q. Which market brought the highest price?

A. The highest price was secured at Cardiff—6s. 6d. per case, but on the whole, London is the best market. We sent consignments to London, Bristol, Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, Leeds, Cardiff and Birmingham. Allow me to make a comparison between the shipments last year and the shipments of 1897. In the first place, in 1897, the peaches were packed in a large case holding about 50 pounds, and simply wrapped in paper.

IMPROVED TRANSPORTATION.

By Mr. Miller:

Q. That was in 1897?

A. Yes. They were evidently over-matured when they were picked and packed. We do not know what temperature they were carried at except that the reports of the ships show that they were carried at about 40 degrees, in some cases a little over that. But the most important point in my judgment was this—that in 1897 the average time from Grimsby to the ports in Great Britain was nineteen days. The average time of the shipments last year was twelve days, a difference of a week. There has been a great improvement in the transportation service in that time. In 1897 the railway service was such that you could not depend on getting a car through at any particular time. You had to allow considerable margin of time to be sure of getting through. Now, in all these shipments last year the railway companies gave us a timetable. We put the cars on a train at 6.30 p.m. and they were in Montreal the following night. The cars left St. Catharines at 6.30 on Wednesday evening and arrived in Montreal Thursday night, and were switched direct to the wharf and the peaches transferred direct to the steamer on Friday. They did that as regularly as clock-work.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. The steamer went at what hour?

A. Saturday morning early. There were usually ten or twelve hours to spare in Montreal. There has been some difference of opinion among growers and shippers as to whether it was better to ship such fruit by express to Montreal and save a day, or whether it should be shipped by a refrigerator car. We think that we have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the refrigerator car was by far the safest plan, and it is worth something to have that point settled. There were private shipments made by express, and with the very first shipment there was an accident to the train and the peaches were delayed a day in the hot sun. If they had been in a refrigerator car, that would have made very little difference. The question of temperature is more important than the matter of one day saved in transportation.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. You told us you took twelve days. Was that from St. Catharines or across the Atlantic?

A. Twelve days from St. Catharines. That is the average. Some, of course, took more than that. The London boats are slower than the Bristol and Liverpool boats, which only take six or seven days to cross the ocean.

PRIVATE SHIPMENTS OF PEACHES.

There were some private shipments made last summer. Mr. C. A. Dobson, of Jordan Station, was the principal shipper, but the Biggs Fruit & Produce Co., Burlington, and Mr. D. Johnson, of Forest, sent small lots. Altogether there were 3,743 cases of peaches shipped from Canada to Great Britain last year, and I am

APPENDIX No. 1

glad to say that all were landed in good condition. I do not know anything about the returns from these private shipments, but I know that Mr. Dobson is preparing to ship again this year on a large scale, so that he is evidently satisfied with the returns he got.

These private shipments were made possible only through the arrangement entered into, by the authority of the minister, with the steamship companies, for the reservation of special fruit chambers, on which the department guaranteed the earnings. If shippers had to pay for the space of a whole chamber for comparatively small lots, the charges would be prohibitive. Our cargo inspectors watched these private shipments carefully, so that we were able to give the shippers much valuable information which they could not have obtained from any other source.

THE OUTLOOK FOR CANADIAN PEACHES IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Now, just a word or two as to the outlook for peaches in Great Britain, because that is important. Peaches in Great Britain have been looked upon as a luxury. I have seen them selling at 60 cents each; a shilling is about the usual price. I remember well in 1908, when I was travelling with the Scottish Agricultural Commission, we went to the Niagara district in the first days of September when the early St. John peaches were in good eating condition. We landed at St. Catharines in the morning, and the fruit growers met us with motor cars and took us through the peach orchards. 'Help yourselves, boys,' was the cry. It looked like the rankest extravagance to the Scotchmen. They could hardly realize it at first. One man said, 'I never ate a peach under a shilling in my life.'

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. In the early part of the season 60 cents and in the fall of the season 25 cents—that is about the price for the local production in Great Britain.

A. The 60-cent peaches are hothouse peaches. The outdoor peaches which come from France and other countries sell for about a shilling each. But peaches are a different thing on the British market to what they are on this market. Take a basket of peaches more or less bruised or damaged, as we get them here, and they would not look at them at all. Every peach must be perfect. They have been trained to that by these high prices, and if you sent them peaches shipped as we handle them in this country, they would not have them at any price. I think it would be possible to get at times as high as 10 shillings a case for Canadian peaches, but you would only sell a limited quantity at that price. We should try to reach what they call over there the middle-class trade, and if we could sell a large quantity of peaches at good prices, we would be serving a better purpose than to sell a limited quantity at a higher price.

By Mr. Wright:

Q. What is the quality of those French peaches compared with our own?

A. They say they are about the same quality. Our best peaches compare very favourably with any peaches grown outdoors. They want a large, well-formed peach, a little coloured, and they prefer a white flesh. They are used to a white-flesh peach. I have in hand a bulletin on these peach shipments, which gives all these details very fully and will be issued shortly.

SOUTH AFRICAN PEACHES.

The South African growers have been sending a large quantity of peaches to Great Britain, but they come during the winter months. They are arriving about this time of the year. They are also arriving in this city, and I am glad to know that there are Canadians who can afford to pay a shilling each for peaches, because

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

that is what these peaches (showing one) are selling for to-day down on Sparks street—that is 25 cents each. The shipment of South African peaches in 1906 amounted to about 7,000 cases. Last year there were 23,000 packages of peaches shipped from that country to Great Britain.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. To what market?

A. To London, and the prices realized average a little higher than ours. They sold at from 2s. 6d. to 8s. a case, and some even as high as 10s. a case.

Q. Have any South African peaches been shipped to Canada?

A. Yes, these are South African peaches (exhibiting peaches). They come via New York.

By Mr. Robb:

Q. Where did you buy those peaches?

A. I think they were purchased at Murphy & Gamble's store.

Q. The South African peaches apparently arrive at a better season than ours do.

A. Yes, they do.

Q. How do the freight rates compare?

A. The freight on South African peaches is 65s. a ton, Cape Town to Southampton, while the ocean freight on ours is only 25s. a ton of 40 cubic feet.

Q. The South African growers are fairly up to date when they made such shipments.

A. They are up to date, all right, in fact I do not mind admitting that I copied the South African package to a very large extent. I sent last year to London and had one of the packages forwarded here. We learned on inquiry that that style of package was giving the very best satisfaction, and we did not hesitate to copy it.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. These South African peaches go first to London and thence to New York.

A. They come to New York direct and are shipped from that city to Canadian points.

Q. Can you tell how long it is since these peaches were picked?

A. Do you mean the South African peaches?

Q. Yes.

A. No. I only got them a few minutes before I came here.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Do you know how long the journey from South Africa to New York occupies?

A. No, I do not. It takes 17 days from Cape Town to Southampton by the fast boats and a little longer by the other lines. That means that the South African peaches are a long time on the way from Cape Town to London, but most of them are grown quite near Cape Town.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. At about what time do they harvest peaches in South Africa?

A. The peaches are on the market from January to March.

By Mr. Miller:

Q. Would not the market of the Canadian Northwest, where the purchasers are a little less particular about quality, be a better one for the Ontario grower?

A. A good many of the peach growers think that with the large increase in the acreage of peach orchards they would not find a market for all they might be able to produce. If they can find a good market for a quantity of their peaches in Great

APPENDIX No. 1

Britain at the higher prices I have mentioned, there is no reason why peach growing cannot be extended very considerably. The development of the British market will require a great deal of care, and I am just a little afraid that with the results which I have given in view, careless growers and packers will endeavour to take advantage of the market and make a fizzle of it. There is a danger of that happening, for the trade will have to be very carefully handled.

By Mr. McLean (Huron):

Q. Peaches are a most profitable crop on the whole?

A. I think they would be considered such. No man would plant apple trees on good peach land in the Niagara district.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Do you know anything about the total production of peaches in South Africa?

A. All I know is that they have during this past year shipped 23,000 cases to London. I have the Trade Commissioner's report but he does not give any figures as to the total peach production. I fancy that the London market, apart from their local market, is the only one they have.

Q. What I wish to ask, is the production of peaches in South Africa on the increase?

A. I think it is increasing very rapidly. South Africa shipped in 1906 only 7,000 packages, and the shipment has been increasing every year until last year it amounted to 23,000 packages. But while the production of South African peaches is increasing considerably, their peaches will never compete with ours, because they come on the market at a different season. All the shipments are finished by the month of April.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Then the South African peaches reach London at a better season?

A. Yes, it is a better season to sell any high-priced fruit in London. They have this advantage, too, that the peaches are landed in England in cool weather and not exposed to a high temperature when they are taken out of cold storage as ours are. It was pretty warm when our peaches landed in England last year, and that is a disadvantage we have to contend with. Although the South African growers are farther away in point of time and the expense of shipping is considerably greater, they have some advantages that we do not enjoy.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. The transportation rates, say from Hamilton or St. Catharines, to the Northwest, would be far higher than they would be from Hamilton or St. Catharines to London?

A. Yes, the freight rate is higher.

Q. That would be a factor against cultivating the Northwest trade?

A. Yes, but there is no reason why an immense trade cannot be done in the Northwest.

Q. When I was in British Columbia, the fruit growers of that province told me their transportation charges from British Columbia to the Saskatchewan market amounted to exactly what they got for the fruit.

A. Of course the rail carriage rate is always higher than the rate for water carriage.

By Mr. Sealey:

Q. Under the order of the Railway Commission the express rates for shipment from the Niagara district to Winnipeg have been reduced from \$2.65 to \$2, or a saving of 11 cents a basket. The railway company gives a very fast freight service

1 GEORGE V., A. 1911

for perishable products such as fruit, the time occupied between Niagara and Winnipeg being about four and a half days.

A. Of course, that point of time is in favour of the Northwest market. The best we can do in putting Niagara fruit on the English market is three weeks from the time of picking until the fruit reaches the consumer. It is going to be rather difficult to always have the fruit in just the right stage when picked and packed so as to reach the consumer in the proper condition, because we are working on a very narrow margin, and peaches ripen quickly.

Q. Some of the fruit this last year went at express rates?

A. You mean to the Northwest?

Q. Yes.

A. We found in the shipping of peaches to Great Britain that the refrigerator car was by far the best and safest means of carriage, and of course shipment by freight was very much cheaper than by express to Montreal.

By Mr. Thornton:

Q. Going back to the question of the shipment of apples again, do you think that the exercise of care in the packing and shipping, that trade would be cultivated just in the way you have indicated?

A. I certainly think it would. I suppose all the members have received a copy of Bulletin 24, which we published last spring, entitled 'A Report on some Trial Shipments of Cold Storage Apples.' This bulletin gives full details of these shipments with the prices obtained for the apples, and it will be sent to any one who applies for it. That would have been the net price to the grower. They varied in price, but I will not go into that, because if you want information on that point you can get it in the bulletin referred to. We divided one lot of apples, leaving half of them in a frost proof warehouse and placing the other half in cold storage. We made a better net return on the apples placed in the cold storage than we did on those in the frost proof warehouse, although we did not have to pay any storage charges on the latter. The saving of waste paid the cost of the cold storage.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure we have listened with a great deal of pleasure, as well as profit, to the address Mr. Ruddick has given us respecting the work he has been carrying on. I think he has demonstrated to us clearly the immense possibility that we have in cold storage. He has shown us here to-day grapes that are not supposed to keep more than two or three weeks, which have been kept for several months and which are now in almost perfect condition. He has shown us most conclusively the great possibilities there are in the development of our fruit industry in the matter of carrying over fruit in cold storage. The address, I am sure, must result in very great benefit to the fruit industry of the Dominion of Canada.

Committee adjourned.

Certified correct.

J. A. RUDDICK.

PART II.
IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

IMMIGRATION

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

COMMITTEE ROOM No. 34,

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization met at 11 o'clock a.m., Mr. M. S. Schell, chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN.—As you have noticed from the agenda paper, we have with us this morning Mr. W. D. Scott, Superintendent of Immigration, who is to give an address on the work of his branch. It is now two or three years since he last appeared before this committee, and the work entrusted to his care is of such importance that we feel sure he will have something valuable to communicate in reference to immigration. I have much pleasure in calling upon Mr. Scott.

Mr. W. D. SCOTT.—As I have not appeared before this committee since 1908, I consider it wise to enter into a brief review of the policy and work of the department with which I am connected, giving an opportunity to members, after I have finished this review, to question me upon any points which I have omitted or upon which they require elaboration.

The policy of the department at the present time is to encourage the immigration of farmers, farm labourers, and female domestic servants from the United States, the British Isles, and certain northern European countries, namely, France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Iceland.

On the other hand, it is the policy of the department to do all in its power to keep out of the country undesirables, which for the purpose of this review I will divide into three classes:—

1. Those physically, mentally or morally unfit, whose exclusion was provided for by Act of Parliament last session.
2. Those belonging to nationalities unlikely to assimilate, and who consequently prevent the building up of a united nation of people of similar customs and ideals.
3. Those who from their mode of life and occupations are likely to crowd into urban centres, and bring about a state of congestion which might result in unemployment and a lowering of the standard of our national life.

While neither the law nor the Orders-in-Council passed thereunder absolutely prohibit the landing in Canada of persons belonging to the second and third classes mentioned, still their entry has been made extremely difficult by the passing of Orders-in-Council Nos. 926, 918 and 920 which, briefly stated, provide that all persons of Asiatic origin must have in their possession, and in their own right at time of landing, the sum of \$200 each in cash; that all immigrants coming from countries issuing passports or penal certificates shall be required to produce either or both at time of arrival, and that all immigrants must come by a continuous journey from the country of their birth or citizenship, and on tickets purchased in that country or prepaid in Canada. None of these Orders-in-Council in any way interfere with the entry into Canada of desirable citizens or subjects of the countries I have already mentioned as being those from which immigration is encouraged, but they do put

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

many obstacles in the way of immigrants from Asia and southern and eastern Europe, and consequently the numbers coming or likely to come from those countries are correspondingly diminished. There is just one other Order-in-Council which is restrictive in its tendency, namely P.C. 924, which provides that immigrants must have from March 1 to October 31 the sum of \$25 per adult and \$12.50 per child in their possession at time of landing, unless going to employment at farm work, or in the case of females to domestic service, or going to join certain specified relatives able and willing to care for them, the amounts specified being doubled for the period between November 1 and the end of February. It was felt by the Government that persons going to city employment, where they would be without near relatives, would really require that amount to keep them independent until their first wages were due. I may here point out that the result of this regulation has been to greatly diminish the amount necessary to be expended on the care of indigent immigrants. For instance, in 1907-8 there was spent through the Winnipeg office, \$23,000 for looking after newcomers before they could be permanently settled, whereas in 1909-10 the amount spent for the same purpose was only some \$9,000. Likewise throughout the whole Dominion reports of hardship amongst newly arrived immigrants have practically disappeared since the inauguration of the money requirement regulation. Of course I do not claim it is by any means an infallible test, but still, generally speaking, the fact that an immigrant has money in his possession at time of landing may be accepted as proof that he has been thrifty and industrious. While it is admitted by all who come directly in contact with the thousands who yearly arrive in the country that a marked improvement in the class of immigrants was noticeable almost immediately after the going into force of the restrictive regulations, this is not the only point upon which the country may congratulate itself, for while the quality has improved the quantity has increased. The only reason I can give for this is that many, held back from going to Canada when they thought there was an open door through which all and sundry might enter, are now eager to take up their home in the Dominion when satisfied that due care is being exercised in the admission of new settlers. So much for the policy. With regard to the administration of that policy, I can only say that at all times the department has endeavoured to be as just and humane as possible, bearing in mind, however, that its duty is to Canada and to Canada only, and that while every applicant for admission who is likely to be an acquisition to the country shall be admitted if the law will permit it; on the other hand, every person who is likely to be a detriment to the country must be rejected if the law will allow it. Having dealt thus far with the general immigration policy, I will now consider the work in countries outside of Canada. In Great Britain and Ireland the immigration propaganda is carried on by advertisements in the newspapers, particular use being made of agricultural journals and papers circulating wholly or largely in the agricultural districts, very little expense being incurred with papers whose circulation is largely urban. The advertising in the newspapers is of two classes: (a) regular display advertisements, calling attention in brief form to the advantages which Canada offers, and giving the address of the nearest government office where full information can be obtained regarding the country, and (b) accounts of trips through Canada by journalists of note, the insertion of such being arranged for by the department, sometimes at the regular advertising rate, or sometimes in return for advertising which has been given to those journals. The newspapers advertising in the British isles for 1908-9 cost \$20,000 and in 1909-10, \$43,000. In practically no case does the department advertise in a newspaper which refuses, when requested, to publish a reasonable amount of good reading material regarding this country. At the present time in the British Isles the department is advertising in 550 papers. In the British Isles a method of advertising which has been very satisfactory has been the exhibit wagons, of which there are two, one working in the north of Scotland and the other throughout Ireland, and two motors, which travel through-

APPENDIX No. 1

out rural England from the middle of March until the end of October. These cars contain samples of Canadian grains, &c., and the parties in charge stop wherever a crowd can most conveniently be collected, lecture on the country, and distribute pamphlets and disseminate information generally. These cars are present at as many markets and fairs as possible, regular exhibits also being made at many fairs. An atlas of Canada is distributed at rural schools, and the rising generation used to agricultural life are thus made aware of the advantages which Canada has to offer. The sending of farm delegates to the British Isles is still pursued the same as in past years. Those of the farm delegates well fitted for public speaking lecture about five nights a week in halls which are arranged for, and at meetings which are advertised by the booking agents in the locality where the meeting is to be held. In almost all cases the buildings are filled to capacity, and as a rule, magic lanterns showing views of Canadian farm life are used in explaining the work which immigrants may expect to find upon their arrival. All those engaged in lecture work are carefully warned to keep well within the bounds of truth, and to arrange for as good a report in the local press as it is possible to obtain. In this way the lecturer reaches not only the audience who are present at the meeting, but also the reading public of the papers in which the report is inserted. Very often the chair at the meeting is occupied by the mayor or other municipal officers, and in other cases by clergymen or others interested in emigration work. At the conclusion of the meetings, it is usual to invite inquiries and any points upon which the audience may be in doubt are then thoroughly explained. Others of the farm delegates are advertised by the booking agents as being present in their offices, to give their personal experience of farming in Canada, and in the majority of cases a large number of inquirers call to learn of Canada from the lips of one who has had practical and personal experience. The regular offices of the department which carry on the work throughout the year by the supervision of the advertising, lecturing, exhibits, &c., are nine in number on the British Isles, located at London, Liverpool, Exeter, York, Birmingham, Aberdeen, Glasgow, Belfast and Dublin. The general work of all these offices is twofold in character: first to encourage all desirable persons to emigrate to Canada, and secondly to discourage the emigration of those who for any reason are likely to prove failures. Of these reasons lack of adaptability is one of the most common, at the same time one of the most serious and also one of the most easily perceivable to one used to dealing with emigrants. In the British Isles it is customary for booking agents, who come in contact with persons about whose success they have doubt, to refer the party to the nearest government office, where the case is considered without prejudice, and advice given which is considered in the best interests of Canada and the prospective emigrant. As there are over 3,000 booking agents in the British Isles, this phase of the work is very important, and when it is considered that a booking agent suffers a pecuniary loss from every prospective emigrant discouraged from emigrating, it is only fair to them to say that they deserve credit for the manner in which they carry on their work.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Are all those agents your agents also?

A. All the booking agents?

Q. The 3,000 of them?

A. Yes. There are, however, some who are more interested in looking after their own interests than the interests of their customers or of this country. It is impossible, however, for them to carry on their work contrary to the regulations of the department for any length of time without coming into conflict with the department, and the steamship companies have evinced a willingness to withdraw their license from such as persist in misrepresentation or giving advice which is not in the best interests of people considering emigration to this country. In the past five

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

years quite a number have been forced out of business on account of their unfair dealings, and even at the present time the cases of a few whose actions have been doubtful are under investigation. Inasmuch as a bonus is paid to booking agents selling tickets to farmers, farm labourers, and female domestic servants, each one of these booking agents is looked upon practically as an agent of the department, and they are supplied with literature by the department for distribution among their prospective customers. The same method is followed by Australia, New Zealand and other colonies seeking immigrants, but so far Canada has been able, by its superior class of literature, and the extra advantages which the country offers, to hold the services of practically all the agents, so that a person desirous of leaving the old country and going to a booking agent for advice, is much more likely to be directed to Canada than to the other colonies. The bonus paid at the present time is £1 per head on adults and 10s. on those between one and eighteen years of the occupations specified.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. What commission do you pay?

A. A bonus of £1 per head on adults, and 10s. on those between one and eighteen years of the occupations specified, that is farmers, farm labourers, and female domestic servants. For the calendar year 1909 the bonus was paid upon 4,063 men, 2,647 women and 1,405 children, while for the calendar year 1910 the bonus was paid upon 9,813 men, 6,015 women and 2,840 children. As the classes on whom the bonus was paid was the same for both years it is very gratifying to note that the numbers for 1910 are more than double those for 1909. New South Wales offers a passage to farmers and farm servants for £6, providing that he has £4 additional in money, and they offer a passage for £3 to his wife and £1.10s. for every member of his family under eighteen years of age, whether there be one or a dozen. They are offering passages to domestic servants for £3, providing they have £2 in money additional, and the booking agents gets £1 in each case. The state of Queensland is offering passages to farmers for £5 providing they have £50 in money additional, and free passages to wives and children, also free passages to domestic servants, providing they are country girls, and it pays 32s. to booking agents for every person booked, whether free or paid.

In all the British offices lecturing is one of the most important branches, and hundreds of lectures are delivered every year by the regular staff. The distribution of the Canadian atlas and school maps is having an excellent effect in directing the attention of the rising generation towards Canada, while the millions of copies of immigration pamphlets distributed in the past few years has gone a great way towards dispelling that ignorance regarding Canada which was at one time only too noticeable in the Mother Country.

On the Continent offices are maintained at Paris and at Antwerp, where newspaper advertising is carried on, the Canadian atlas distributed to schools when possible, lectures arranged, literature distributed, personal inquiries answered and a knowledge of Canada disseminated by all means possible. The government agents have the assistance of certain selected booking agents, to whom a bonus is allowed on passengers booked by them, the bonus being of the same amount and paid on the same classes as is the case in Great Britain.

In the United States, the department has eighteen regular offices, located as follows:—

Detroit, Mich.; Kansas City, Mo.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Omaha, Neb.; Grand Forks, N.D.; Toledo, Ohio; Great Falls, Montana; Boston, Mass.; Providence, R.I.; Spokane, Wash.; St. Paul, Minn.; Chicago, Ill.; Watertown, S.D.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Marquette, Mich.; Pittsburg, Pa.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Biddeford, Me.

APPENDIX No. 1

At each one of these offices a regular immigration propaganda is carried on throughout the year. Advertisements appear in the newspapers, and each newspaper carrying a departmental advertisement inserts twice a year a column and a half of reading matter pertaining to western Canada, which is prepared under the supervision of the department, bringing to the attention of the readers of the paper items of interest which are likely to induce people to emigrate here. At the present time advertisements are appearing in about 5,000 newspapers. In addition to the display advertisements and reading matter referred to, special articles on Canada are from time to time provided to such papers as are willing to accept them, in addition to which numbers of newspaper associations are taken through the country at departmental expense, the members of which provide articles on their trip, and publicity is thus secured which could in no other manner be obtained.

Next to newspaper advertising the exhibits at fall fairs, in rural villages, and county towns is the next best method of advertising in the United States. These exhibits are seen by exactly the class of people wanted in Canada, and no stronger argument can be made to them than a view of the produce of this country, which compares so favourably both in quality and quantity with that grown in the United States. From the regular offices and at exhibitions are distributed large numbers of the pamphlets prepared by the department. In the United States the department has 45 sub-agents, who issue to intending settlers certificates which entitle them to a cheap rate on Canadian railways, besides giving to the intending immigrants information which would be of use to them. These sub-agents are paid a commission of \$3 on men, \$2 on women and \$1 on children under eighteen years of age, belonging to the farm class, whom they send to the Dominion.

The literature distributed by the department in the British Isles, the Continent and the United States is compiled in Ottawa. Great care is taken that all statements are absolutely correct, and every effort is made to keep the maps and statistical information strictly up to date. Some of the pamphlets deal with the Dominion as a whole, while others deal with individual provinces. Besides distribution from the offices outside of Canada, a large amount is distributed direct from the head office.

When immigrants from Europe and the British Isles commence their journey and arrive at a British ocean port, they are, before going on board the vessel for Canada, inspected by a Board of Trade doctor and a doctor of the company upon whose steamship they intend to travel. During the voyage they are seen at least once daily, and once during the trip an individual medical inspection is made by the ship's surgeon, whose duty it is to report, on a departmental form, to the Canadian immigration doctor, any cases regarding whose physical or mental condition he may have reason to have doubt. These cases are given special attention, and since the introduction of this system the work of the ship's surgeon has shown marked improvement. Upon arrival all the immigrants are carefully examined by the Canadian immigration doctors and civil examiners, to see that they thoroughly comply with the existing laws and regulations. During the calendar year 1909, 155 British immigrants were rejected at ocean ports, and during the calendar year of 1910, 252 British immigrants were rejected at the ocean ports. Of these numbers it may be interesting to you to know that in 1909, 21 were rejected for insanity and 7 for tuberculosis, while in 1910, 19 were rejected for insanity and 20 for tuberculosis. After being passed by the immigration officials, immigrants attend to the checking of their baggage and arrange for their inland transportation, after which they embark on special trains and proceed to their destination. Owing to the large number of arrivals from the United States it was felt that some system of inspection along the international boundary should be inaugurated, and in April, 1908, a system of border inspection was established and gradually extended until the present, when all recognized routes of travel are covered by departmental officials. In 1908-9, there were rejected 4,580 intending immigrants, which increased to 8,997 in 1909-10

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

By Mr. Proulx:

Q. Did you say there were 4,000 immigrants from the United States rejected?

A. In 1908-9 there were 4,580, and in 1909-10, 8,997. At the present time there are employed on this border service, 69 regular officers and 132 customs officers, who also attend to immigration matters. During 1910 these officers rejected 14,131 applicants for admission, who were not considered desirable, while during the same period only 252 British settlers were rejected at ocean ports.

Q. What was the reason for rejecting those immigrants?

A. They were rejected because the inspector did not consider them desirable, either on account of disease or under the Orders-in-Council passed by the Canadian government.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. Are there any of our agents travelling on the railway trains on the other side of the line?

A. Yes, some of them are

Q. Is there an arrangement between our government and that of the United States whereby agents of the American government can travel on Canadian trains in Canadian territory?

A. The arrangement is made with the railway companies. Trains are held for this purpose at the international boundary.

Q. But what is done in the case of trains that do not come to the international boundary?

A. They make arrangements in certain other cases also. Take the case of trains running through southern Manitoba, along the Deloraine branch, where the trains run close to the international boundary. I believe the American government have an officer there to look after the people and find out where they are going, because a great many undesirables could slip into the United States by driving across the boundary where there is no officer on duty.

At Vancouver, Victoria and Prince Rupert an examination is made of trans-pacific passengers similar to that conducted at Quebec, St. John, Halifax and Sydney on the east coast.

In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec there are 125 Canadian government employment agents, whose duties are to place at farm work or domestic service newly arrived immigrants desiring such employment. These agents are paid on a per capita basis of \$2 for each person so placed at work. If they do no work they receive no pay, and in this way it is possible to have the services, when necessary, of a much larger number than would be possible were they to be paid on a salary basis. Those going to and west of Winnipeg are handled through the immigration offices located at that point.

Located throughout the west, and under the supervision of the Dominion Lands agents, there are 63 land guides, whose duties are to conduct and locate persons wishing to settle on homesteads. These land guides are paid at the rate of \$2 per day by the department, the cost of food and team hire being borne by the settler whom they are guiding.

In connection with the success which has attended the immigration propaganda, I may mention that in the calendar years 1899 to 1904, of the 1,145,305 who left the British isles, 206,236, or 18 per cent, came to Canada, while in the years 1905-1909, of the 1,401,787 who left the British Isles, 515,720, or 37 per cent, came to Canada.

Canada and the United States are the two countries on the North American continent receiving immigrants from Europe, and it is therefore interesting to compare the classes going to the two places. An examination of statistics shows that during the last nine years of the immigration from Europe to Canada, 71 per cent came from the British Isles and those northern countries in which I have already

APPENDIX No. 1

mentioned active immigration work is carried on, while from Southern and Eastern Europe there were only 29 per cent. On the other hand, during the same period the United States has received 77 per cent of its European immigrants from the south and east, and only 23 per cent from the British Isles and northern continental Europe.

Turning now to the effect which immigration has had upon the actual settling of the land in the Northwest, we find very gratifying results which, while not wholly attributable to immigration, is largely effected by it. The Canadian Pacific Railway land sales increased from 376,046 acres in 1908-9 to 975,030 acres in 1909-10, or an increase in one year of 159 per cent. Canadian Northern Railway land sales increased from 116,662 acres in 1908-9 to 246,996 acres in 1909-10, or an increase of 112 per cent, and the acreage of land homesteaded from 6,252,960 acres in 1908-9 to 6,650,880 acres in 1909-10. We thus find that the land disposed of by the two companies mentioned and taken by homestead from the area of free grant land controlled by the Dominion Government increased from 6,745,668 acrts in 1908-9 to 7,872,906 acres in 1909-10.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. You have no information, I presume, to show how much of that land was taken up by immigrants?

A. The homesteads were not all taken up by immigrants; a great many were taken up by Canadians. For instance, in the calendar year 1910, the total number of homestead entries made was 48,257. Of this number 13,494 entries were made by Canadians from all parts of the Dominion, and 672 by Canadians returning from the United States.

By Mr. Best:

Q. What remuneration is paid the immigration agents?

A. The regular agents of the government are paid a salary and also travelling expenses while away from headquarters. The booking agents are paid a bonus for the farmers, farm labourers and female domestic servants when they book, but receive no salary.

Q. Tell us what it cost the Dominion of Canada in 1910 to bring immigrants from the British Isles.

A. Do you mean for bonuses?

Q. The total cost of bringing out these immigrants in the form of bonuses, salaries and advertisements?

A. The approximate cost of bringing immigrants to Canada from the British Isles during the fiscal year 1909-10 was \$233,577. This includes salaries, bonuses, expenses of farmer delegates, advertisements, &c.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Can you tell us how many immigrants each agent has sent or handled in the Old Country?

A. No.

Q. Do not the agents report?

A. No.

Q. Why do they not report? You pay the booking agents a per capita sum for every immigrant they send?

A. Yes.

Q. Why not have the same information from your regular agents?

A. We have never considered it necessary.

Q. Why?

A. Because they are working in all parts of the country, not selling tickets.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

Q. There might be an arrangement made by which the figures could be got; I mean arrangements between the agents on commission and those on salary?

A. It would not be possible to do that.

Q. You think you could not do that?

A. No. It is not possible.

Q. Could you not get information from the agents of the Canadian provinces that are also engaged in the immigration business as well as the Dominion?

A. Do you mean in Great Britain?

Q. Yes, you know who those agents are, do you not?

A. Yes. The Ontario government has an agent in Great Britain, and also the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia.

Q. Those are all the provinces that have an immigration agent in Great Britain?

A. Yes.

Q. Well, should not these provincial agents be working in unison with your branch?

A. They are working in perfect harmony with our department; in fact I may say that most of the literature which they distribute is printed by our department.

Q. Are any of the provincial governments paying a bonus on immigrants or granting assisted passages to immigrants?

A. The Ontario government, I understand, do something of that kind. Last year they assisted passengers of a certain class; they paid a portion of passage money to Canada of farmers, farm labourers and domestics.

Q. Does that not interfere with our Dominion law?

A. No, not at all.

Q. I understand that no assisted passages can be paid?

A. That is quite true. The people the Dominion Government agents deal with are not the same class as those whose passages are assisted.

Q. I understand that the law makes no difference in the matter of the class?

A. The only persons that we pay the bonuses on now are farmers, farm laborers and domestic servants.

Q. Have they got to get a permit from the Assistant Superintendent at London before they are allowed to come?

A. They have to get a medical certificate.

Q. But the people whose passages are partially paid by the Ontario government, do they require to get a certificate from our representative in London?

A. We agree to accept the card of the Ontario government's agent in London, Mr. Colcook, that the immigrants he sends are desirable people.

Q. You have inspectors along the frontier in Canada?

A. Yes.

Q. Are they engaged the year round?

A. Yes.

Q. Could you give us a list of the places to which they are attached?

A. Yes, I could furnish you with that.

Q. I think it would be desirable that we should have that information, also the salaries paid to them?

A. Yes.

Q. Are they regular salaried officers?

A. The boundary inspectors are all salaried officers.

Q. I find that one inspector was at Brockville for seven months last year. Did you not have an agent there for a longer period than seven months?

A. We have no boundary inspector at Brockville.

Q. Well, what was this man's business?

A. I suppose he was placing farm laborers for farmers, at points around Brockville.

APPENDIX No. 1

Q. Then, do you get men from the outside to go to these towns, and pay them salaries and also expenses?

A. Which?

Q. Do you pay these men regular salaries?

A. To whom are you referring?

Q. These men you have been speaking of?

A. Yes, to the boundary inspectors.

Q. This man I spoke of was getting \$100 a month and some of his expenses?

A. What is his name?

Q. George Anson Aylesworth?

A. Mr. Aylesworth is an inspector of the employment agents throughout Ontario. He sees what work they are doing and ascertains their suitability for the work and so on. In the winter time we employ him at lecturing in England; he is there now.

Q. Why was he located at Brockville?

A. I did not say that he was.

Q. The Auditor General's Report says so?

A. That may be.

Q. Cannot we depend upon the Auditor General's Report?

A. I could not tell you, I am sure. If you want to know Mr. Aylesworth's headquarters, I can tell you.

Q. I know where he lives. I know the man and I have nothing to say against him. I simply want to get this information. I notice his name on a return brought down of special immigration agents appointed since 31st of March, 1909. I also observe in the same return the name 'Agnes Dean Cameron.' Is that a lady?

A. Yes, a lady.

Q. She gets a pretty good salary, \$220 a month, and her expenses last year amounted to \$1,770.02. What does this lady do?

A. She writes for magazines and newspapers.

Q. Where?

A. She is in London, I believe, just now.

Q. She is employed in connection with the office there?

A. Yes.

Q. Well, how can you account for such a bill of expenses as I have mentioned?

A. She travels and lectures, besides doing newspaper work.

Q. But do you not think that the amount of expenses is very large?

A. I think that it is very reasonable.

By Mr. Herron:

Q. What did you say her name was?

A. Agnes Dean Cameron. She wrote a work on 'The New North.'

Mr. ROBB.—It is one of the finest works ever published on that country.

The WITNESS.—I have not read it.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. I see here too the name of 'Reverend J. A. Winfield, St. Stephen, N.B.' He is paid a salary of \$100 a month, and his expenses were \$1,340.71. What does he do?

A. He is a special agent in the Old Country. He has been working principally in connection with bringing out immigrants to Prince Edward Island. He has been very successful, having brought out a party of 60.

Q. His expenses were very much more than his salary?

A. That may be. Some of us do not get sufficient salary.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

Q. I notice another man here, William Griffith. His salary is \$100 a month, and his expenses, \$1,313.84. What is his business?

A. He was working in Wales last year.

Q. He also gets a pretty good salary. Now, what arrangement have you about furnishing clothing to your officers?

A. We furnish all our regular officers with two uniforms a year.

Q. And sometimes three?

A. Occasionally they meet with accidents and have to get a third uniform, but very rarely.

Q. They get pretty good clothes, don't they?

A. I think the average cost is about \$25 a suit, and they pay one-third of that themselves. It costs the Department usually about \$16 or \$17 a suit.

Q. How long has that been going on.

A. Since the passing of the last Immigration Act.

Q. That is last session?

A. Yes, last session.

Q. I notice they get pretty good overcoats too?

A. Yes, they usually get an overcoat once in two years.

Q. At \$35?

A. Yes.

Q. I notice in the United States they do not pay for any uniforms for their officers?

A. I do not know anything about that.

Q. That is in their regulations. If you will look at Article 47 of the Regulations you will find that they do not pay for the uniforms, that the officers pay for their own uniforms?

A. I think their salaries compare a little higher.

Q. Have you withdrawn any agents from any part of Europe?

A. No.

Q. You are still in Southern Europe?

A. We never were in Southern Europe.

Q. Didn't the North Atlantic Trading Company work in Southern Europe?

A. That is many years ago. We have not in late years.

Q. How many agents have you over there?

A. We only have them in Antwerp and in Paris.

Q. I understood you had withdrawn some of your agents in Europe?

A. No.

By Mr. Herron:

Q. You spoke of having commission agents in the United States. How do they trace the emigrants from where their ticket is taken and know that he crosses the boundary of the States into Canada?

A. We have an arrangement with the Canadian railway companies, whereby they accept a certificate issued either by our own officers or by those commission men, for a cheap reduced rate on their lines from the boundary line to where they wish to settle. You know a railway clerk cannot issue a reduced rate unless he has some authority. These certificates are accepted by the railway company for issuing a reduced rate from the International boundary to the point in the west where the immigrants wish to settle. After the railway companies have checked their reports, they send these certificates to us so that we are able then to check our reports with them.

APPENDIX No. 1

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. Would a man going in to look over the country, presumably with a view of settling in it, get the reduced rate?

A. Certainly.

Q. Though he might go back and never settle in Canada?

A. Yes.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Does the government pay any part of the reduced rate?

A. No.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. How many came over from the United States last year?

A. In 1909-10 there were 103,798, and for the nine months up to the end of December in the present fiscal year there were 97,702.

Q. You have no way of telling then, how many of those went back? As Dr. Sproule has said, they might just get their certificate issued by an agent and come over and look at the land, and, if it was not satisfactory, go back. You have no record of them?

A. No, we do not keep any track of the outbound.

Q. No telling how many of those 103 odd thousand that came over settled in Canada?

A. There is by homestead entries. For instance, last year for 1909-10, there were 14,032 entries granted to Americans.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. The United States report gives a very different version of it. In the report of their commission, which was issued last year, they say we got 116,377 immigrants and that they got from us 94,496, leaving a net gain to us of 21,881. Of the total that went into the United States, they say that 44,328 were Canadian citizens and that left 50,168 that were foreigners. That is in their commissioner's report just issued?

A. We do not keep any track of people leaving Canada.

Q. Why not? Lord Strathcona keeps count. You have seen his report to the department?

A. No, I have not.

Q. It is in your report, in the Blue Book issued by the department? He says there were sent to Canada 113,315, and that there returned 46,791, leaving a net increase to us of 66,524?

A. Of course it is a very easy thing to keep track of ocean transportation, because they have to file manifests, but on the International boundary where there are ferries and trains crossing and re-crossing, it is an absolute impossibility.

Q. Well, the Americans seem to keep it?

A. That may be. We have no desire yet to interfere with the traffic or to bother people. I think possibly they have enough troubles going backwards and forwards across the boundary without being asked further questions.

Q. But we cannot tell, unless we have some information of the people who leave this country, what immigration we are getting. If we did not have in Lord Strathcona's report the number of those who went back, I would have supposed that 103,000 came in, but he gives us the 46,000 that returned.

A. They count everybody that goes on a ship, whether on a single or a return ticket.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

By Mr. Wilson (Laval):

Q. First-class passengers, too?

A. Everything.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. I think your own report gives a net increase the same as this?

A. During the year 1909-10 the steamship companies carried into Canada 148,843 people. We only classified 104,996 as immigrants. There were 26,953 people who, when examined at the ocean ports on the return journey, said they were either Canadian-born or had been in Canada before. Therefore we classed them as returned Canadians, not as immigrants. Of the first-class passengers 11,401 came to Canada and steerage 137,442, or a total of 148,843.

Q. Out of which there were some from the United States, I suppose?

A. That is for Canada only.

Q. But what about those that came to Canada from the United States?

A. They are not in this classification at all.

Q. I did not like to bring all the reports, the United States reports, but I think they are very interesting because they give a lot of information that our reports do not give. I do not see why we are not entitled to know the total number that leave Canada just as well as those who come in?

A. I would not like to have the job of questioning the people going across the boundary.

Q. You have quite a job now. Will you furnish us with a list of inspectors?

A. At the boundary points?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

Q. Their salaries, when they were appointed, and not only the salaries but the expenses, and whether they are on commission or are regular salaried officers?

A. There are none on commission.

Q. Is Mr. Aylesworth in the service by the year?

A. By the year.

Q. He gets what?

A. I think \$100 a month.

Q. And expenses?

A. When travelling, yes.

Q. How long has he been that way?

A. I should think for three or four years.

Q. The reason I am interested is that he came down to my town during election time and made a speech in the Liberal room. He was only giving information on immigration, of course.

By Mr. Wilson (Laval):

Q. How many agents are there?

A. On the International boundary?

Q. Yes?

A. We have 69, I think.

By Mr. Herron:

Q. You were speaking of guides; I would like to know what is the arrangement in regard to them?

A. Do you mean the land guides?

Q. Yes.

A. The land guides are paid \$2.00 for each man they settle on a homestead. The settler pays for his own food and his own livery hire.

APPENDIX No. 1

Q. I thought you said you paid them \$2.00 a day?

A. No. They are paid \$2.00 for each settler they settle on land.

By Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar):

Q. Do you know the value of the settler's effects brought into Canada?

A. No. The Customs Department will tell you that. When the immigration officer issues a certificate for low rates to intending immigrants, he asks the individual for the value of his cash and effects, and the information is reported to us. We do not compile all the facts because it would be a very tedious thing, but we do take individual States, and the sum each individual brings in averages about \$1,000 per head.

Q. I saw a statement in the *Winnipeg Free Press* a short time ago purporting to give the amount of each settler's effects and how much cash he brought in last year. I was wondering if you had any record of that.

A. The Customs Department would have the amount of actual effects brought in.

Q. The Customs Department would not have the amount of cash though?

A. No.

Q. How would a newspaper get hold of that information?

A. I could not say, I am sure.

Mr. SHARPE.—The newspaper referred to claimed there was about \$150,000,000 brought across during the year.

By an Honourable Member:

Q. You have no way of following up information in order to ascertain how many settlers, American particularly, would have taken out their patents for homesteads and then returned to the United States?

A. No.

Q. There is no way of ascertaining that?

A. No.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. I understand you to say that you pay your sub-agents in the United States \$3 a head for those immigrants they send into Canada?

A. Yes.

Q. How do you check the number they send in?

A. We check them by the certificates that are issued.

Q. You told us some time ago that these certificates are issued to tourists?

A. They are issued to prospectors as well, and in order to obtain the return ticket there would have to be marked on the face of the certificate 'tourist' or 'prospector.'

Q. Is the immigration agent paid \$3 a head for those the same as for the others?

A. No. The amount paid last year for bonuses for these local agents was very small, being only \$3,900.75. The year before, 1908-09, it was \$4,127.75.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Have you got the amount paid to the United Kingdom in bonuses?

A. I think so.

Q. You might give it to us please.

A. The British bonuses paid in 1908-09 amounted to \$35,955.08, and in 1909-10 the amount paid was \$39,145.65.

Q. I would like to get the names of the special agents you are sending to the Old Country, their place of residence in Canada, the points to which they have been sent, and the amounts paid to them for salary and expenses.

A. For what period would you like that information?

Q. I would like to have it for all of last year and up to the 1st of February this year.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

A. It would be difficult to get the information up to the 1st of February this year, because while these people are in the Old Country their expenses are paid from the London office, and we would not get the report of disbursements to them until the 15th of the following month.

Q. Then up to what date can you give me that information?

A. Up to the end of January, probably, or December.

By Mr. Wilson (Laval):

Q. Can you give the number of Boundary Inspectors, roughly speaking?

A. I think there are on the International Boundary 69, but I will give you the correct figures in a moment.

Q. I am not insisting upon the exact figures.

A. I think the number of regular agents is 69. They do nothing else but attend to immigration work. Then there are one hundred and some odd Customs officers who assist in the Immigration work. Some of these are paid \$100 and others \$50 a year for the immigration work they do, in addition to their stipend as Customs officers.

By Mr. Robb:

Q. Do the railways pay any share of the cost of advertising for immigrants who come in and buy their lands?

A. Yes, in this way: they grant the settler a reduced railway rate. Then they give our officers free transportation, and they issue a very large amount of literature themselves.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. In giving the land sales, as an evidence of the increased immigration I presume, you have no data which would show the percentage of land sold to immigrants and the percentage that may have been sold to Canadians?

A. No.

Q. I would imagine that the immigrants would not be likely to go in very extensively for land purchases.

A. Well, the class of immigrants we are getting now is improving all the time. I notice in reading one of our reports from Great Britain the statement that one farmer was coming out with £15,000, or \$75,000. Now that is a very nice sum of money to bring out to a new country.

Q. I should think they would prefer to purchase homesteads with some improvements on them.

A. A couple of years ago we had a party of Scotch Agriculturists out. Before we brought them here we experienced active opposition from those farmers to the emigration of farm labourers; they wanted them to remain in Scotland. Well, we induced this party to come out to Canada and they went over the Dominion from Prince Edward Island to the Pacific Coast. The consequence was that after seeing the country they purchased 37 quarter sections and are putting 37 farmers from Scotland on those lands.

Q. They purchased that land from the railroad companies?

A. No. They purchased from private individuals; it was an old ranch. I think they purchased it from Mr. Hull, a stock breeder who had an old ranch to sell.

By Mr. Sinclair:

Q. Can you tell me if the advertisement given to Canada by the recent reciprocity agreement has brought in more inquiries than usual from the United States?

A. I could not tell you that, Mr. Sinclair. All I know is that I had a letter from one of our Inspectors in the States, who said it was causing a great deal of

APPENDIX No. 1

discussion there, and he added that any discussion in regard to Canada was good advertising.

By Mr. Sharpe (Ontario):

Q. Has your correspondence fallen off a little?

A. No; it has not. I might say that during last year I received in our office here over 286,000 attachments to our files. That will give you an idea as to the volume of our correspondence. A thousand letters a day is a pretty good showing.

By Mr. Stanfield:

Q. Has any record been kept of the number of domestics brought out last year?

A. In 1909-10 we had 8,396 domestics.

Q. Have you kept any record of them?

A. Yes, we do keep track of them?

Q. Have you any record of the number that have gone west?

A. They scatter generally throughout Canada.

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. I think you give the number of deportations in your annual report, but not the reasons for which the deportations were made.

A. The reasons for deportations? Yes, that information is in the annual report.

Q. I did not notice it there.

A. It is also in this small pamphlet (holding up pamphlet) that we are distributing, which gives the deportations by nationalities and also by causes.

By Mr. Robb:

Q. Is the list of deportations sent back to the booking agent?

A. Where we have paid a bonus on an immigrant and he is afterwards found to be undesirable through insanity or sickness, we deduct it when we pay the next bonus.

By Mr. Stanfield:

Q. In what way do you follow up the domestics? Have you any letters to show what becomes of them?

A. We send a circular letter to the employers and ascertain the degree of satisfaction the domestics are giving, and what they are being paid. We have thousands of replies in the office from employers, and I should think that from 95 to 98 per cent of these replies are satisfactory.

Q. You have nothing to do with the domestics that come from the province of Nova Scotia?

A. No.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. You are referring, I presume, to the immigrants that you settle yourselves in the country?

A. Yes.

Q. As farm labourers?

A. I mean domestics that are settled in the country or in the cities, wherever they are needed.

Q. And you think that 90 per cent of those domestics are doing satisfactorily?

A. Yes, from the replies we have received from the employers.

Q. That has not been our experience.

A. Perhaps you struck one of the bad ones.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

By Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. Will you furnish to the committee all the Orders-in-Council and regulations that you have?

A. Yes, I have a copy here.

Q. Have you a copy of the new ones issued lately?

A. Not since this volume was published. The Orders-in-Council are all in this.

Q. Do you not issue regulations, circulars and so on?

A. Do you mean instructions to agents?

Q. Yes. Are there very many of them? You haven't them in consolidated form?

A. No.

Q. Then we cannot tell whether the circulars are still in force or not?

A. Yes, if you could tell me the subject.

Q. I would have to look the matter up very carefully.

A. There are instructions issued to boundary inspectors, ocean port inspectors, and so on.

Q. I would like to see the Orders-in-Council.

A. The Orders-in-Council are all printed in this book, immediately after the Immigration Act.

Q. Mr. Oliver caused some amendments to be made to the Act this year. Was there anything of importance in those changes other than you have explained?

A. The idea is to explain what is meant by certain words and to enable us to carry out the meaning of the Act better; that is all. Those instructions have not been printed yet.

Q. Are you going to change your ways and tell us now whether you will keep track of those people that leave the country as well as of those that come into it?

A. I think you had better discuss that matter with the Minister.

By Mr. Sproule:

Q. I suppose you have no source of information that would enable you to determine the number of immigrants that turn out criminals after they come here?

A. I can tell you the number of immigrants that we deport after they get into the country and become criminals.

Q. The number of deportations and the cause would be shown in your report?

A. Yes

Br. Mr. Wilson (Lennox and Addington):

Q. If a man is convicted before a magistrate do you deport him?

A. Yes, if he is reported to us by the clerk of the municipality or the magistrate.

Q. But you do not deport in every case of conviction, for example if a man happens to get drunk?

A. Unless we found he was an habitual drunkard. If the man was before a magistrate for drunkenness continually we would certainly send him back.

Q. Would it not be possible, Mr. Scott, for you to issue your immigration matter in a separate pamphlet?

A. We are doing so. We are bringing it out as soon after the close of the fiscal year as possible.

Q. I have not received this year's yet.

A. Copies were sent to every Member and to every Senator.

The CHAIRMAN.—We have listened with great pleasure to this very illuminating address by Mr. Scott, and the information that he has given us will be read with profit throughout the country. I am sure we will be very glad to have him come before us at any time and explain what is being done by our Immigration Department.

APPENDIX No. 1

We are pleased to have Mr. Wilson taking the interest that he is in this matter, because friendly criticism is always valuable when the critic's motive is to improve the existing conditions. I am sure the committee thoroughly appreciate the address which Mr. Scott has given us this morning.

Committee adjourned.

Certified correct,

W. D. SCOTT.

ADDENDUM

List of Canadian Government Border Inspectors.

NOVA SCOTIA.

Station.	Date of Appointment.	Inspector.	Salary per annum.
			\$ cts.
Clementsport		W. C. Jones, sub-coll. cus-toms.....	Without salary.
Yarmouth.....		W. R. Cann.....	100 00
Port Hawkesbury.....	Feb. 5th, 1910.	J. J. Williams.....	300 00

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Andover.....		Thos. R. Cameron.....	100 00
Aroostook Junction.....		W. E. Spike.....	100 00
Clair.....	July 25, 1910.....	Jas. A. Long.....	800 00
Centreville.....		Willmott Ballock.....	100 00
Debec.....	July 25, 1910.....	Oliver Hemphill.....	800 00
Edmundston.....	Jan. 13, 1911.....	Francis Michaud.....	800 00
Grand Falls.....		H. W. Taylor.....	100 00
Green River.....		Joachim Theriault.....	100 00
Milltown.....		D. K. Harmon.....	100 00
Richmond Road, (address, Woodstock, N.B.).....		Robt. Warren Bull.	100 00
St. Leonards.....	Dec. 21, 1908.....	Epiphane Nadeau.....	900 00
St. Stephen.....	April 15, 1909.....	G. H. Sullivan.....	800 00
".....		Thos. K. McGeachy.....	100 00
".....		S. N. Hyslip.....	100 00
".....		N. B. Hawthorne.....	100 00
St. Andrews.....	July 25, 1910.....	Jas. Cummings.....	800 00
Upper Mills.....		Henry Hacker, P.O. address, Baring, Me.....	100 00
Vanceboro, Me.....	Dec. 1, 1908.....	Newton S. Dow.....	1,100 00
McAdam Junction, N.B.....	April 30, 1909.....	Robt. O'Shaughnessy.....	1,000 00
Wilson's Beach.....		Jno. A. Newman.....	100 00
Welsh Pool, (address Campobello).....		Alvin Parker.....	100 00
Portland, Me.....		J. Williams.....	100 00
Boston, Mass.....		J. Lunney, (returns to St. John on Nov. 1).....	
Highwater.....	Feb. 19, 1909.....	1. Chas. Greene.....	900 00
".....	March 1, 1909.....	2. M. T. Eldridge.....	900 00
Beebe Junction.....	April 7, 1909.....	Desire Neveau, Jr.....	900 00
".....		J. F. Paquette.....	50 00
".....		W. Curtis.....	50 00
".....		Homer Worthem.....	50 00
".....		C. H. Bellam.....	100 00
".....	June 1, 1910.....	N. C. Knight.....	50 00
Coaticook.....	Dec. 4, 1908.....	L. B. Murphy.....	800 00
".....	July 25, 1910.....	Louis Audet.....	800 00
Comin's Mills.....		Jas. P. Simpson.....	100 00
Dundee.....		Jno. D. McMillan.....	100 00
Freighsburg.....		J. H. Baker.....	100 00
Georgeville and Newport.....		J. A. Hutchinson.....	100 00
Paquetteville.....	Dec. 1, 1910.....	Geo. Dagenais.....	800 00
Magog.....	July 6, 1910.....	D. L. Mullins.....	50 00
Megantic.....	April 15, 1910.....	Angus Cowan.....	800 00
Malone, N.Y.....	Nov. 21, 1903.....	A. Pansera.....	1,000 00
Noyan Junction, address, Alburg, Vt.....	March 27, 1909.....	Benj. Menard.....	800 00

APPENDIX No. 1

LIST of Canadian Government Border Inspectors.—*Continued.*NEW BRUNSWICK—*Continued.*

Station.	Date of Appointment.	Inspector.	Salary per annum.
			\$ cts.
Rouse's Point, N. Y.	June 1, 1908	Calixte Commette.....	1,200 00
"	Dec. 1, 1910	Edouard Moquin.....	800 00
"	E. A. Gallett (Lacolle Jun.)	100 00
Stanhope	O. L. Young.....	100 00
St. Albans, Vt.	May 20, 1906.....	1. Jas. Stahl.....	1,000 00
St. Armand, Quebec.....	June 5, 1909... ..	2. Stellman P. Knight...	900 00

ONTARIO.

Amherstburg		N. Barrett.....	100 00
Bath.....		D. T. Rowse.....	100 00
Belleville.....		Wm. Williamson.....	50 00
Blind River.....		G. C. McGuire.....	100 00
Bridgeburg.....	Dec. 15, 1908.....	F. S. Dilworth.....	1,100 00
"		F. T. Pattison.....	100 00
"		Wm. Griffin.....	100 00
"		J. Wilson.....	100 00
Brighton.....		J. H. McMaster.....	50 00
Brockville.....		Thos. Burns.....	100 00
Bruce Mines		Matthew Grose.....	50 00
Cardinal.....		No appointment.....	
Cobourg.....		J. G. Hagerman.....	100 00
"		Jas. Bulger.....	100 00
Collingwood.....		W. F. Toner.....	100 00
Cornwall.....	Oct. 20, 1909.....	{ J. M. O'Callaghan.....	800 00
		{ Ed. J. Cleary.....	100 00
		{ J. H. Cline.....	100 00
Courtwright.....		Robt. Stockdale.....	100 00
Crystal Beach.....		Jno. Young.....	100 00
Ridgeway, P. O.		W. J. Kirk.....	100 00
Cutler.....		F. J. Drewitt.....	100 00
Depot Harbour.....		T. C. Maloney.....	100 00
Deseronto.....		Warren Eagan.....	50 00
Erie Beach (a/ d. Fort Erie P. O.)	July 9, 1910.....	A. E. Seaton.....	900 00
Fort Erie.....	Dec. 1st, 1908.....	W. F. Wilson.....	100 00
"		P. S. Johnston.....	100 00
Fort Francis	Jan. 1st, 1909.....	J. A. Osborne.....	1,200 00
Fort William.....	Oct. 10, 1908.....	A. H. Wilson.....	900 00
Gananoque.....		M. J. Lee.....	100 00
Goderich.....		Jas. L. Grant.....	50 00
Iroquois.....		Jas. D. Bullis.....	100 00
Kincardine.....		Appointment deferred until next spring.....	
Kingston.....		Geo. H. Comer.....	50 00*
"		Jas. Hanley.....	50 00*
"		W. D. Graves.....	50 00
"		Jno. Geoghogan.....	100 00
Lewiston, N. Y.		G. C. Congdon (in summer)	1,200 00
Little Current.....		Richard English.....	50 00
Manitoulin Island.....		Saml. Vyvyan.....	50 00
Midland.....		A. G. F. Drew.....	100 00
Morrisburg.....		*1. Chas E. Willox.....	1,200 00
Niagara Falls.....	June 18, 1908	2. Beckley Carter.....	900 00
"	May 15, 1909.....	3. Matthew H. Prentiss..	900 00
"	Aug. 19, 1909.....	4. Michael G. Goodsir....	900 00
"	Oct. 4, 1909.....	5. George Thomas.....	900 00
"	Oct. 7, 1909.....	(a) Frank Whitewell,	
"		(Queenston Bridge....	100 00
"		(b) Ralph Field, (Queenston Bridge....	100 00

* Sum'r season.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

List of Canadian Government Border Inspectors.—*Continued.*ONTARIO—*Continued.*

Station.	Date of Appointment.	Inspector.	Salary per Annum.
			\$ cts.
Niagara Falls		(c) Rich. Sloggett, (G.T.R. Br.)	100 00
"		(d) J. M. Wallace, (G.T.R. Br.)	100 00
"		(e) Jno. Murray, (G.T.R. Br.)	100 00
"		(f) J. J. Flynn, Head Office	100 00
"	June 1, 1910	(g) Rich. Gott (Mist Ferry Dock in summer, Ice Bridge in winter)	100 00
Owen Sound		P. J. Malone	50 00
"		Walter McNeil	50 00
"		Jas. Frost	50 00
Ojibwa	Feb. 19, 1909	Arsene Dufour	900 00
Parry Sound		Wm. Ireland	50 00
Pictou		W. T. Ross	50 00
Port Arthur	1908	J. M. McGovern	1,200 00
Port Burwell		Wm. Backhouse	50 00
Port Colborne	Aug. 11th, 1910	C. D. Emmet	100 00
Port Dalhousie		W. B. Clark	100 00
Point Edward		Orlando S. Clark	100 00
Port Hope		John McMullen	50 00
Port Dover		J. R. Davis	100 00
Port Lambton		Albert Mickle	100 00
Port Stanley		W. H. Farr	100 00
Prescott	Dec. 25, 1908	1 Geo. Walsh	900 00
"	Dec. 25, 1908	2 C. S. Easton	900 00
"	June 19, 1909	3 Bernard C. Hughes	900 00
Rainy River		Covered temporarily by Inspector at Sprague	
Rockport		Wm. Dickson	100 00
Rondeau (address Erieau, P.O.) ..		Chas. Mallory	50 00
Sarnia	March 3, 1909	1 Walter R. Meyers	1,000 00
"	March 30, 1909	2 Peter Symington	900 00
"	Jan. 7, 1909	3 Henry Bell	800 00
"		Andrew Murray (Ferry)	100 00
"		Alex. Ross (Ferry)	100 00
"		Jas. Alcock (Ferry)	100 00
"		D. Gray (N. Nav. Co.)	50 00
Sault Ste. Marie	Feb. 27, 1909	1 J. C. Armstrong	1,100 00
"	April 8, 1909	2 Thos. Hanratty	1,000 00
"	July 18, 1910	3 Franklin Tier	900 00
"	Dec. 23, 1910	4 George B. Cahoun	800 00
Sombra		John Burnham	100 00
Southampton		Appointment deferred until next spring	
Thessalon	June 1, 1910	W. A. McEwen	50 00
Toronto	Jan. 21, 1908	Thos. Anketel	840 00
Trenton		Robt. Fraser	No salary.
Walkerville		1 A. T. Montreuil	100 00
"		2 John Bailey	100 00
"		3 Wm. Leighton	100 00
"		4 Francis St. Louis	100 00
"	Feb. 1, 1911	5 Arthur C. Teno	100 00
Walpole Island		Wm. Hinnegan	100 00
Windsor	Aug. 29, 1908	1 Thos. T. Robinson	1,200 00
"	Feb. 15, 1909	2 C. E. Mason	900 00
"	Feb. 15, 1909	3 Thos. Brian	900 00
"	Jan. 18, 1910	4 John M. Halstead	900 00
"	Feb. 5, 1909	5 F. Chas. Quallins	800 00
"	Oct. 1, 1910	6 David J. Cheyne	800 00
"		a Narcisse Thibert (Ferry)	100 00
"		b Albert J. Walker	100 00
"		c Jos. W. Yearsley	100 00

APPENDIX No. 1

LIST of Canadian Government Border Inspectors.—*Continued.*ONTARIO—*Continued.*

Station.	Date of Appointment.	Inspector.	Salary per Annum.
			\$ cts.
Windsor ..		dGeo. H. Bennett.....	100 00
" ..		eJas. W. Kerr	50 00
" ..	April 1, 1910 ..	fThos. Hy. Yates.....	100 00
" ..	Jan. 1, 1911....	gMarshall Thompson ..	50 00
Wolf's Point (Summer season only) address Walkerville, P.Q.			

MANITOBA.

Bannerman ..	Jan. 8, 1901....	D. W. Agnew	1,200 00
" ..		Philip Scott.....	100 00
Emerson ..	Aug. 18, 1903....	1T. J. Connell.....	1,200 00
	May 1, 1909.....	2F. S. Bell.....	1,100 00
	Feb. 10, 1911 ..	3Peter Palmason.....	1,000 00
Gretna.....	April 1, 1910....	O. J. Gould.....	1,000 00
Haskett.....		J. A. Klassen.....	100 00
Mowbray.....		Jas. Conner.....	100 00
Sprague.....	Feb. 10, 1909....	J. W. Caldwell.....	900 00

SASKATCHEWAN.

North Portal.....	April 1, 1905....	Geo. McIntyre.....	1,000 00
	May 1, 1904.....	J. A. Potvin	1,000 00
	Aug. 5, 1909	Hy. Watson.....	1,200 00

ALBERTA.

Coutts.....	Oct. 1, 1898....	C. Mair.....	1,200 00
		H. Tennant.	100 00

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Atlin ..			100 00
Bridestville ..		A. F. Eddy	100 00
Carson ..		Jas. A. Stewart.....	100 00
Cascade (Laurier) ..		A. Cameron	150 00
Douglas (near White Rock; for earlier inspection at Douglas see File 774004 i.e. Whiterock).....		C. J. Trodden	100 00
Gateway ..		A. J. Joule	100 00
Grand Forks ..	January 15, 1909 ..	P. T. McCallum.....	1,000 00
" ..		W. J. Cook.....	100 00
Gauges Harbour P.O. (Sault Spring Island) ..		A. R. Bittancourt, patrol boat for Gulf of Georgia, ½ share of expenses.....	800 00
Huntingdon.....	(Feb. 26, 1908....	A. E. Skinner	1,200 00
	(May 10, 1910....	John McMurphy.....	1,000 00
Keremoos.....		W. Frith	150 00
Kingsgate.....	April 18, 1906....	Jno. Dunlop.....	1,000 00
" ..		A. J. Chisholm.....	100 00
Ladner ..		(Resigned).....	
Ladysmith.....		Thos. D. Conway.....	100 00
Myncaster ..		J. H. Methot.....	100 00
Midway ..		R. D. Kerr.....	150 00

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

List of Canadian Government Border Inspectors.—*Continued.*

Station.	Date of Appointment.	Inspector.	Salary per Annum.
			\$ cts.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Continued.*

Osoyoos.....		D. Coristine.....	100 00
Nanaimo		Henry L. Good	100 00
Paterson		W. M. Wood	100 00
" supervised generally by Inspr. O'Neill of Waneta.....			
Peardonville.....		S. Campbell.....	100 00
Prince Rupert.....	Sept. 20, 1909.	Dr. J. O. Reddie	1,500 00
Port Simpson		Jas. Sharpe	100 00
Rykerts.....		J. C. Rykert.....	100 00
Rossland, B.C. (looked after by inspector at Paterson).....			
Seattle, Wash., c.o. Butler Hotel..		S. Reid.....	1,200 00
" c.o. Can. Customs.....		A. J. Armstrong.....	100 00
Stewart (Portland Canal).....	July 1, 1910	Wm. Millar	100 00
Union Bay, Vanc. Id.....	April 1, 1910	Geo. H. Roe.....	100 00
Upper Sumas		T. F. York.....	100 00
Vancouver.....	Sept. 8, 1908	J. H. Macgill.....	1,500 00
"	Feb. 8, 1909	W. C. Hopkinson.....	1,200 00
"	May 1, 1905	Thomas Elliott	1,200 00
Victoria	Sept. 12, 1904	Dr. G. L. Milne	2,750 00
"	Feb. 16, 1907	Robert Roff	1,200 00
"	Dec. 13, 1910	Jno. W. Speed	900 00
Waneta, address Ymir, B.C.....	June 10, 1910	A. C. O'Neill	1,000 00
"		John P. Vroom.....	100 00
White Rock	April 20, 1909.	J. C. Cornish	1,000 00
"	March 1, 1907.	A. E. Humphries	1,000 00

YUKON TERRITORY.

Forty Mile.....	Resigned.....		
White Pass		Geoffrey T. Butler	100 00

APPENDIX No. 1

FARMER DELEGATES sent to the British Isles and Europe, Fiscal Year 1909-10.

Name.	Residence in Canada.	Salary.	Expenses.
			\$ cts.
Irwin, Donald.....	Lloydminster, Sask.....	4 months at \$100 per month.....	761 50
Munn, Fred A.	Kelliher, Sask.....	3 " " " ".....	471 69
Anderson, Jas. L.	Clova, Sask.....	2½ " " " ".....	342 89
Slater, Jas.....	Moose Jaw, Sask.....	3 " " " ".....	484 74
Tennant, Jas.....	Kinistino, Sask.....	3 " " " ".....	481 87
Gorrie, John.....	Giroux, Man.....	3 " " " ".....	420 98
Trayer, Benj.....	Whitebrush, Alta.....	3 " " " ".....	452 62
Bishop, W. S. V.....	Regina, Sask.....	3 " " " ".....	580 11
Barker, Marm.....	Saltcoats, Alta.....	3 " " " and 20 days.....	475 57
Smith, Avery.....	Saskatoon, Sask.....	3 months at \$100 per month.....	459 39
Akroyd, Rit.....	Wainwright, Alta.....	4 " " " ".....	590 08
Heathcote, Jos.....	Kitscatty, Alta.....	3 " " " ".....	567 72
Ottewell, J. G.....	Fortunburg, Alta.....	3 " " " ".....	417 58
Waddington, Ed.....	Alameda, Alta.....	4 " " " ".....	638 29
Forsyth, John.....	Neepawa, Man.....	3 " " " ".....	297 40
Davis, Chas.....	Whitewood, Sask.....	3 " " " ".....	335 74
Gamby, Alex. D.....	Griswold, Man.....	3 " " " ".....	453 82
McHugh, J. J.....	Calgary, Alta.....	3 " " " ".....	606 16
Deleau, Seb.....	Deleau, Man.....	3 " " " ".....	375 18
Creighton, W. O.....	Westriver, N.S.....	3 " " " ".....	350 87
Foster, F. W.....	Kingston, N.S.....	3 " " " ".....	511 26
Larcombe, S.....	Birtle, Man.....	3 " " " ".....	718 28
Cranston, David.....	Ft. Sask, Alta.....	2 " " " ".....	176 27
Kennedy, Thos.....	Ulster, Alta.....	4 " " " and 26 days.....	594 93
Winfield, Rev. J. A.....	St. Stephen, N.B.....	\$100 per month.....	742 68
Enns, Jerard.....	Rosthern, Sask.....	4 4-30 months at \$100.....	602 84
Turgeon, J. G.....	Hardisty, Sask.....	5 months at \$100.....	885 47
Vanden, B. S.....	Edmonton, Alta.....	3 " " " ".....	490 91
Brewster, E. W.....	Compton, Que.....	4 " " " ".....	508 83
Aylesworth, G. A.....	Newburgh, Ont.....	4 " " " ".....	511 50
Curtiss, Jesse.....	Brideport, Eng.....	(Expenses only for 3 months).....	150 08
Cameron, Agnes D.....		4 months at \$200.....	2,592 62
Steven, Alex.....	Summerland, B.C.....	2 months at \$100.....	164 74
Little, N. W.....	Heaton Moor, Alta.....	1 month and 5 days at \$100.....	86 99
McCowan, H. S.....	Dunstable, Alta.....	3 months at \$100.....	115 11
Bardal, H. S.....	Winnipeg, Man.....	6 " " " ".....	1,143 43
Craigie, G. R.....	St. John, N.B.....	4 " " " ".....	277 98
Griffith, Wm.....	" " " ".....	8 " " " ".....	1,613 84
Wilson, F. H.....	Edmonton, Alta.....	3 " " " ".....	179 49
Leslie, Archie.....	Camrose, Alta.....	1 " " " ".....	nil.

(The above delegates were distributed by Mr. J. Obed. Smith, Assistant Superintendent of Emigration, London, Eng.)

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

FARMER DELEGATES sent to the British Isles and Europe, Fiscal Year 1910-11.

Name.	Residence in Canada.	Salary.	Expenses.
		(From Dec. 1.)	\$ cts.
Wright, F. W.	Astwood, Sask.	4 months at \$100 per month.	
Stephenson, Geo.	Paynter, "	4 " "	
Douthwaite, Jos.	Eagle Hill, Alta.	4 " "	
Yake, Hugh.	Moose Jaw, Sask.	4 " "	
Ramsay, Peter.	Headlands, "	4 " "	
Salloway, Benj. P.	Halcyonia, "	4 " "	
Willoughby, R.	Wooglen, Alta.	4 " "	
Brunskill, J. W.	Pense, Sask.	4 " "	
Claibb, Geo.	Morris, Man.	4 " "	
Peace, Matthew	Wadena, Sask.	4 " "	
Butterfield, J. J.	Forster, "	4 " "	
Collens, H. H.	Vermillion, Alta.	4 " "	
Krengan, John.	Viking, "	3 " "	
Vinnis, Geo.	Bunessan, Ont.	4 " "	
Sampson, Hy.	Brandon, Man.	4 " "	
Riddell, J. J.	Winnipeg, "	4 " "	
Lyle, J. P.	Lloydminster, Sask.	4 " "	
Lyall, Peter.	North Portal, "	4 " "	
Oliver, Ed.	Moose Jaw, "	6 " "	
Hosford, S. R.	Brandon, Man.	\$75 per month	
Myers, C. C.	Ottawa, Ont.	2 months at \$100 per month.	
Mercier, Geo.	Dumas, Sask.	3 " "	
King, David.	Lethbridge, Alta.		
Frederickson, F.	Winnipeg, Man.	5 months at \$100 per month.	
Williams, John.	Melita, Man.	6 " "	
McKenzie, P. H.	Lucknow, Ont.	6 " "	
Bourke, Rev. T. E.	Kingston, Ont.	4 " "	
Johnson, Chas. E.	Fillmore, Sask.	4 " "	
Aylesworth, Geo. A.	Napanee, Ont.		
Brewster, E. W.	Lennoxville, Que.	5 months at \$100 per month.	
Chamberlain, R.	Toronto, Ont.	3 " "	
Graham, Jos.			
Craigie, G. R.	St. John, N.B.	4 months at \$100 per month.	
McLeod, David.		4 " "	
Winfield, Rev. J. A.		4 " "	
McLeod, A. D.	Storoway, Sask.	4 " "	
Cameron, Agnes D.		\$250 per month.	
Gordon, George.	Oak Lake, Man.	2 months at \$100 per month.	
Little, W. R.		3 " "	
Sutcliffe, Peter.		2 " "	
Aime, Char.	Emerson, Man.	2 " "	

(The above delegates were distributed by Mr. J. Obed Smith, Assistant Superintendent of Emigration, London, Eng.)

APPENDIX
TO THE
PRECEDING REPORT

INTERIM REPORTS.

FIRST REPORT.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization beg leave to present the following as their First Report:—

Your Committee recommend that the following evidence, taken by them during the current session of Parliament, be printed forthwith in separate pamphlet forms, in the usual numerical proportions of English and French, as advance sheets of the Committee's final report:—

1. Twenty thousand (20,000) copies of the evidence of Dr. William Saunders, Director of Dominion Experimental Farms, for distribution as follows:—17,000 copies to members of Parliament, 800 copies to witness, 1,500 copies to Department of Agriculture and 100 copies to the use of Committee.

2. Forty thousand (40,000) copies of the evidence of Mr. J. H. Grisdale, Dominion Agriculturist, for distribution as follows:—37,000 copies to members of Parliament, 800 copies to witness, 2,000 copies to Department of Agriculture, and 200 copies to the use of Committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. S. SCHELL,
Chairman

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

January 26, 1911.

SECOND REPORT.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization beg leave to present the following as their Second Report:—

Your Committee recommend that the following evidence, taken by them during the current session of Parliament, be printed forthwith in separate pamphlet forms, in the usual numerical proportions of English and French, as advance sheets of the Committee's final report:—

1. Twenty thousand (20,000) copies of the evidence of Mr. James E. Johnson, of Simcoe, Ontario, for distribution as follows:—18,200 copies to members of Parliament, 1,500 copies to Department of Agriculture, and 300 copies to the use of Committee.

2. Twenty thousand (20,000) copies of the evidence of Mr. A. G. Gilbert, Poultry Manager, Central Experimental Farm, for distribution as follows:—17,900 copies to members of Parliament, 400 copies to witness, 1,500 copies to Department of Agriculture, and 200 copies to the use of Committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. S. SCHELL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

February 9, 1911.

1 GEORGE V, A. 1911

THIRD REPORT.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization beg leave to present the following as their Third Report:—

Your Committee recommend that Forty thousand (40,000) copies of the evidence of Mr. A. G. Gilbert, Poultry Manager, Central Experimental Farm, given before the Committee on Wednesday, February 22, 1911, be printed forthwith in pamphlet form, in the usual numerical proportions of English and French, as advance sheets of the Committee's final report, for distribution as follows:—27,000 copies to members of Parliament, 2,000 copies to Department of Agriculture, 800 copies to witness, and 200 copies to the use of Committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. S. SCHELL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

February 23, 1911

FOURTH REPORT.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization beg leave to present the following as their Fourth Report:—

Your Committee recommend that Forty thousand (40,000) copies of the evidence of Mr. J. A. Ruddick, Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner, Department of Agriculture, given before the Committee this session, be printed forthwith in pamphlet form, in the usual numerical proportions of English and French, as advance sheets of the Committee's final report, for distribution as follows:—

36,600 copies to members of Parliament, 2,000 copies to Department of Agriculture, 1,200 copies to witness, and 200 copies to the use of Committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. S. SCHELL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

March 8, 1911.

FIFTH REPORT.

The Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization beg leave to present the following as their Fifth Report:—

Your Committee have had under consideration Bill No. 157, An Act respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds, and have agreed to report the same with amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. S. SCHELL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

April 6, 1911.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

RELATIVE TO THE

CHARGES PREFERRED BY P. E. BLONDIN, M.P.,
AGAINST A. LANCTOT, M.P., RICHELIEU.

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT



OTTAWA

PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST
EXCELLENT MAJESTY

1911

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
1. Orders of Reference..	5
2. Reports of Committee..	7
3. Minutes of Proceedings..	9
4. Synopsis of Exhibits..	29
5. Index to Witnesses..	33
6. Minutes of Evidence..	35

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, November 25, 1910.

Ordered, That the following members do compose the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, viz.:—

Aylesworth,	Dubeau,	McColl,
Barker,	Emmerson,	Maddin,
Barnard,	Geoffrion,	Major,
Borden (<i>Halifax</i>),	German,	Martin (<i>Regina</i>),
Bristol,	Gervais,	Meighen,
Brodeur,	Haggart (<i>Lanark</i>),	Monk,
Bureau,	Haggart (<i>Winnipeg</i>),	Northrup,
Carvell,	Kyte,	Porter,
Chisholm (<i>Antigonish</i>),	Lafortune,	Pugsley,
Cowan,	Lancaster,	Rhodes,
Crocket,	Lapointe,	Rivet,
Crothers,	Lemieux,	Roy (<i>Montmagny</i>),
Demers,	Lennox,	Sifton,
Devlin,	Lewis,	Stratton, and
Doherty.	Macdonald,	Warburton.—45.

Attest.

THOS. B. FLINT,

Clerk of the House.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

MONDAY, March 6, 1911.

Ordered, That the following statement be referred to the said Committee:—

That in the course of the years 1908, 1909 and 1910, irregularities, abuses, frauds, malversations and robberies have been committed in the shops and stores of the Government of Canada at St. Joseph de Sorel and in the City of Sorel, in the electoral districe of Richelieu;

That barrels and tins of paint and other goods of this nature have been illegally and fraudulently taken and carried away from the said stores and shops and transported to the house of Mr. Adelard Lanctot, then and now a member of the House of Commons of Canada, for the electoral district of Richelieu, which house was then being built on George Street, at Sorel above mentioned, and ready to be painted.

That with these goods and paint, paint works, decoration and varnish work, have been done by the employees of the Government of Canada under the supervision of the painters' foreman employed by said Government at the said place, at the Government's expense and during the hours supposed to be devoted to the Government and for which said employees were paid by the Government, these men registering each day as if they had really worked for the government, and this during the weeks and months; the materials and time, thus furnished, are valued at about one thousand or twelve hundred dollars;

That said goods were so fraudulently appropriated to, and said work so fraudulently done at the expense of the Government of Canada for the benefit of the said Adelard Lanctot, then and now a Member of the House as aforesaid, with his knowledge, assent and approval, the said Adelard Lanctot abusively and fraudulently profiting at the public expense and to the public detriment by his position as Member of the House;

Attest. THOS. B. FLINT,
Clerk of the House.

MONDAY, March 6, 1911.

Ordered, That the declarations and matters above set forth be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of this House in inquire fully into the same, with power to send for persons, papers, records and such articles as may be necessary for such investigation, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the Committee do report in full the evidence taken before them and all their proceedings on the reference and the result of their inquiries.

Attest. THOS. B. FLINT,
Clerk of the House.

TUESDAY, March 7, 1911.

Ordered, 1. That leave be granted the said Committee to have all their proceedings and any evidence taken by them in this inquiry printed from day to day for the use of members of the Committee, and that Rule 74 be suspended in reference thereto.

2. That leave be granted to the said Committee to sit while the House is in session.

3. That the quorum of the said Committee be reduced to fifteen (15) members.

Attest. THOS. B. FLINT,
Clerk of the House.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE

FIRST REPORT.

TUESDAY, March 7, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections beg leave to present the following as their First Report:—

Your Committee recommend:—

1. That leave be granted the Committee to have all their proceedings and any evidence taken by them in this inquiry printed from day to day for the use of members of the Committee, and that Rule 74 be suspended in reference thereto.

2. That leave be granted to them to sit while the House is in session; and

3. That the quorum of the Committee be reduced to fifteen (15) members.

All which is respectfully submitted.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

SECOND REPORT.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which were referred certain charges preferred by Mr. Pierre Blondin, Member for Champlain, against Mr. Adelard Lanctot, Member for Richelieu, beg leave to present the following as their Third Report:—

Your Committee finds that the charges aforesaid have not been established but have been altogether disproved.

Your Committee finds the facts to be that about the end of May, 1910, Mr. Lanctot, in the absence of Mr. L. G. Papineau, the Director of the Government Shipyard at Sorel, applied to Mr. Oscar Champagne, Timekeeper of the employees there, to be allowed to have some of the men so employed do some of the work of painting and glazing at a house Mr. Lanctot was building in the town. Mr. Champagne assented and during the months of June, July, August, September, October and November, 1910, some ten or eleven different workmen in the employment of the Government did, in all, 217 days work of this character at Mr. Lanctot's house. In September four other men also in the employment of the Government similarly did six days work as labourers at or in connection with Mr. Lanctot's premises. It was agreed that Mr. Lanctot should pay the amount the men were receiving from the Government, and at different times while the work was going on at his house Mr. Lanctot offered to pay the wages to the men so employed, but Mr. Champagne preferred that payment should not be made till the work was finished. Mr. J. B. Pagé, Government Foreman of painters at Sorel, kept a record of each day's work which was done for Mr. Lanctot by Government employees, making his entries each evening

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

and from this record an account was made up by the timekeeper, Mr. Champagne, and sent to Mr. Lanctot by mail on the 21st November, 1910. This account shows Mr. Lanctot indebted to the Department of Marine and Fisheries of Canada for 223 day's labour charged at the rate of wages each workman had been paid by the Government and amounting to \$375.62. On receiving this account Mr. Lanctot paid it immediately by cheque for the amount drawn payable to the Department of Marine and Fisheries or order.

During the course of the work some material consisting of paint, oil, varnish and putty belonging to the Government was, at Mr. Lanctot's request, sent to his house and used there. In asking for this material Mr. Lanctot had promised to replace it later by an equal quantity of like material of equal quality. In setting aside this material for Mr. Lanctot before sending it to him, Mr. Pagé weighed or measured the goods and kept a note of the quantity. In December an equal, or in some cases a slightly greater quantity of the like goods was obtained by Mr. Papineau, the Director of the Shipyard, from the Mount Royal Colour and Varnish Company, of Montreal, and received into stock at Sorel, without charge to the Government, payment for the same having been made to the company by Mr. Papineau, and Mr. Lanctot recouped to Mr. Papineau in cash the amount so paid to the company, together with the charges for carriage of the goods to Sorel.

In the opinion of Your Committee the fair and reasonable value of the goods so used, and of the work so done at Mr. Lanctot's house does not exceed the amounts paid by Mr. Lanctot therefor.

Your Committee feel in view of the very serious nature of the charges made that they should express an opinion on the propriety of Mr. Blondin making the charges in the manner he did. Your Committee do not wish to state that Mr. Blondin did not believe there was truth in the allegations, or that he did not act from a bona fide belief in their truthfulness, but the Committee think that before making so serious a charge against an honourable member of the House of Commons, he should have made some independent inquiry to verify the truthfulness of the charges made and, which he apparently did not do. The Minister of Marine was called as a witness. His evidence as to this is on page 191 where he says he had information that no fraud had been committed and that all labour supplied by the shipyards had been paid for and all material supplied had been returned and which information he would have been pleased to give Mr. Blondin had he applied for same.

Your Committee think that if Mr. Blondin had made these inquiries he would not and should not have made these charges.

Your Committee also beg to submit herewith, for the information of the House, the minutes of their proceedings and the evidence taken by them during the inquiry.

All which is respectfully submitted.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, March 7, 1911

The Committee met at eleven o'clock, a.m.

PRESENT.—Messrs. German, chairman; Barker, Barnard, Brodeur, Bureau, Carvell, Chisholm (Antigonish), Crocket, Crothers, Demers, Devlin, Doherty, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Haggart (Winnipeg), Kyte, Lancaster, Lapointe, Lennox, Macdonald, McColl, Maddin, Major, Martin (Regina), Meighen, Monk, Northrup, Rhodes, Rivet, and Warburton.—30.

On motion of Mr. Northrup, it was

Ordered,—That Mr. Blondin, M.P., be represented by counsel.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Brodeur, it was

Ordered, That as the greater part of the evidence to be adduced before the committee will probably be given in the French language, the services of two French stenographers as well as of an interpreter be therefore secured and that the selection of the latter be left to Messrs. Blondin, Lanctot and the chairman.

On motion of Mr. Monk it was

Ordered, That leave of the House be asked to have all the proceedings of, and evidence taken before the committee, printed from day to day for the use of members of the committee.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Brodeur it was

Ordered, That the evidence taken daily by the committee be translated into English from day to day.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Brodeur, it was

Ordered, That a report be made to the House recommending that the quorum of the committee be reduced to fifteen members and that leave be granted the committee to sit while the House is in session.

On motion of Mr. Northrup it was

Ordered, That the clerk of the committee be hereby authorized to issue summonses to such witnesses as Mr. Blondin may require to appear at the next meeting and that the names of such witnesses be given the clerk not later than Friday next, the 10th instant.

The Committee then adjourned until Tuesday next, 14th inst., at 10 o'clock a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,

Chairman.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

TUESDAY, March 14, 1911.

The Committee met at ten o'clock a.m.

PRESENT:—Messrs. German, Chairman, Barker, Bristol, Brodeur, Bureau, Chisholm (Antigonish), Crothers, Demers, Devlin, Doherty, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Haggart (Winnipeg), Kyte, Lancaster, Lapointe, Lennox, McColl, Maddin, Martin (Regina), Monk, Northrup, Rhodes, Rivet, Roy (Montmagny), and Warburton.—26.

The minutes of the last meeting were considered as read and confirmed.

On motion of Mr. Barker it was

Ordered,—That Mr. Blondin be heard before the committee by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C., his counsel.

On motion of Mr. Barker it was

Ordered,—That Adelard Lanctot, a member of the House of Commons, be requested to produce his cheque or cheques or other vouchers showing the payment of \$292.50 or any other amount or amounts for wages of men and paints, supplies or other merchandise supplied by the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Sorel or at St. Joseph de Sorel during June, July, August, September, October and November, 1910, for the painting, decorating and finishing of his house and premises on George street at Sorel as aforesaid, together with all accounts, bills, invoices or statements rendered to him by Oscar Champagne, an employee of the said department, or any other employee thereof in connection therewith.

On motion of Mr. Barker it was

Ordered,—That the following documents be produced by the officer in charge thereof acting for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, viz.: All books, documents, contracts, agreements, letters, correspondence, telegrams, receipts and vouchers, pay-lists, punch cards, dials, sheets and records for registering the time and hours of labour of employees of the department at Sorel and St. Joseph de Sorel, the whole touching the work and supplies furnished by the department or any of its employees in connection with the painting, puttying, tinting, varnishing, decorating and finishing the house and premises of Adelard Lanctot, situated on George street, at Sorel aforesaid, during the years 1909-1910, and also all accounts for such things furnished to said Adelard Lanctot by Oscar Champagne, an employee of the department, or by any other employee, together with receipts or vouchers showing payment by Adelard Lanctot therefore, in whole or in part. And also touching the house, premises and lodging rented and occupied by the said A. Lanctot on King street, Sorel, during the year 1908, and especially during October, 1908; and that the same be left in the hands of this committee and its officer for inspection by P. E. Blondin, M.P., his counsel and all members of the committee.

On motion of Mr. Devlin it was

Ordered,—That Mr. Lanctot be heard before the committee by Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C., of Montreal, his counsel.

On motion of Mr. Barker it was

Ordered,—That Joseph Pratt, of Sorel, and Cyrille Labelle, of Sorel, be summoned and required to appear and give evidence before the committee, and that they

APPENDIX No. 3

bring with them and produce all books of account, bills or invoices, statements and vouchers of paints, varnish, tinctures, dyes, putty, brushes and merchandise ordered by and on behalf of or sold and delivered to A. Lanctot for his house and premises on George street at Sorel during June, July, August, September, October and November, 1910.

On motion of Mr. Devlin it was

Ordered,—That Eugene St. Jean be engaged to act in the capacity of interpreter. Whereupon the Chairman administered the oath to the said E. St. Jean.

Of the witnesses summoned the following were reported as present, viz.: Messrs. L. G. Papineau, Albert Thibaudeau, fils, Georges Cartier, Alfred Douaire, Henri Proulx, Andronique Sénécal, Napoléon Laroche, Herménégilde Lambert.

Mr. A. Lanctot, M.P. (Richelieu), being called was sworn and examined by Mr. McDougall.

During his examination the following exhibits were produced and marked as exhibits, viz.:—

Exhibit No. 1.—Cheque of A. Lanctot for \$375.62 on Molsons Bank, Sorel, dated November 22, 1910, and made payable to the order of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Exhibit No. 2.—Statement of wages of men, date November 21, 1910.

Exhibit No. 3.—Declaration of Alfred Douaire, Sorel, dated March 1, 1911.

Exhibit No. 4.—Declaration of Henri Proulx, Sorel, dated March 1, 1911.

Exhibit No. 5.—Declaration of D. Peloquin, Sorel, dated December 29, 1910.

Exhibit No. 6.—Declaration of A. Senecal, Sorel, dated March 1, 1911.

Exhibit No. 7.—Declaration of N. Laroche, St. Joseph Sorel, December 28, 1910.

Exhibit No. 8.—Declaration of H. Lambert, St. Joseph Sorel, February 18, 1911.

Exhibit No. 9.—Declaration of A. Douaire, Sorel, March 5, 1911.

Exhibit No. 10.—Letter from O. Champagne to A. Lanctot dated November 21, 1910.

Exhibit No. 11.—Letter from A. Lanctot to L. G. Papineau dated November 22, 1910.

Exhibit No. 12.—Letter from L. G. Papineau to A. Lanctot dated December 2, 1910.

Exhibit No. 13.—Voucher for \$81.60, Mount Royal Colour & Varnish Co., Ltd., dated December 12, 1910.

Moved by Mr. Lennox, that all questions put by counsel to witnesses be put in English. Motion declared lost.

At one o'clock p.m. the committee took recess.

THREE O'CLOCK P.M.

On motion of Mr. Barker it was

Ordered,—That the following employees of the Department of Marine at Sorel and St. Joseph de Sorel be summoned and required to appear and give evidence before the committee, viz.:—

Ulric Latraverse, accountant; Arthur Lavallée, employee; Jean Baptiste Pagé, chief of the painting department; Théodore Emond, painter; Edmond Brault, painter; Adélarde Letendre, painter; Albéric Letendre, painter; Omer Pagé, painter; Arthur Trempe, painter; Louis Paul, painter; Adélarde Alie, painter; Henri Proulx, painter; Henri Paul, painter; Cuthbert Champagne, painter; Joseph Proulx, painter; Dieu-

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

donné Peloquin, carpenter; Octavien Lafrenière, painter; Omer Lamoureux, manufacturer; Oscar Champagne, employee; Norman Massé, storekeeper; Augustin Payette, foreman painter; all of Sorel.

On motion of Mr. Geoffrion it was

Ordered,—That the examination of Mr. Lanctot be deferred until the other witnesses have been heard.

On motion of Mr. Barker it was

Ordered,—That the foregoing decision be reported to the House.

GEORGE CARTIER being called, was sworn, examined and discharged from further attendance.

The committee then adjourned until to-morrow (Wednesday) at ten o'clock a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

WEDNESDAY, March 15, 1911.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

PRESENT:—Messrs. German, chairman; Barker, Barnard, Brodeur, Bureau, Carvell, Chisholm (Antigonish), Cowan, Crothers, Devlin, Doherty, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Gervais, Haggart (Winnipeg), Kyte, Lancaster, Lapointe, Lennox, McColl, Martin (Regina), Northrup, Rivet, Roy (Montmagny), and Warburton.—25.

The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed.

HENRI PROULX was sworn, examined and cross-examined.

At one o'clock, p.m. the Committee took recess.

3.30 o'clock, p.m.

The examination of Henri Proulx was resumed.

During his examination the following memo. was read and filed, and marked as Exhibit No. 14. Memo. signed by Louis Paul stating that he worked for one month for A. Lanctot and was paid therefor by the government.

On motion of Mr. Kyte it was

Ordered, That all reference in the evidence in connection with work done at the church and hospital at Sorel be expunged from the record as irrelevant to the investigation.

ALFRED DOUAIRE was sworn, examined and cross-examined.

The Committee then adjourned until to-morrow (Thursday) at 10 o'clock, a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

APPENDIX No. 3

THURSDAY, March 16, 1911.

The committee met at ten o'clock, a.m.

Present:—Messrs. German, Chairman, Barker Barnard, Brodeur, Bureau, Carvell, Chisholm (Antigonish), Crothers, Demers, Devlin, Doherty, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Gervais, Haggart (Winnipeg), Kyte, Lancaster, Lapointe, Lennox, Monk, Roy (Montmagny), and Warburton.—22.

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed.

The examination of Alfred Douaire was concluded and the witness discharged from further attendance.

Josep Pratt was sworn and examined. During his examination an account was produced and filed and marked as Exhibit No. 15. The witness was then discharged from further attendance.

The following witnesses were sworn, examined and cross-examined and discharged from further attendance, viz.: Andronique Sénécal, Napoléon Laroche, and H. Lambert.

L. G. Papineau was sworn and examined.

The committee then adjourned to Tuesday next the 21st inst., at ten o'clock, a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1911.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

PRESENT.—Messrs. German (Chairman), Baker, Brodeur, Bureau, Chisholm, (Antigonish), Crothers, Demers, Devlin, Doherty, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Gervais, Kyte, Lancaster, Lapointe, McColl, Major, Monk, Rivet, Roy (Montmagny) and Warburton.

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed.

L. G. PAPINEAU was called and identified certain papers produced by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

ULRIC LATRAVERSE was sworn and examined.

The examination of L. G. Papineau was resumed and concluded.

During his examination the following letters, &c., were produced and marked as exhibits, viz.—

Exhibit No. 16—Letter (original) A. Lanctot to L. G. Papineau, dated November 22, 1910, inclosing cheque for \$375.62.

Exhibit No. 17—Cheque for \$375.62 payable to order of Molson's Bank credit Receiver General being for refund from A. Lanctot for labour supplied.

Exhibit No. 18—Letter L. G. Papineau to Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, dated January 12, 1911, inclosing certificate of deposit of the Receiver General for \$375.62.

Exhibit No. 19—Letter Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries to L. G. Papineau, dated January 16, 1911, acknowledging receipt of foregoing and requesting statement of labour.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Exhibit No. 20—Account amounting to \$81.30 handed L. G. Papineau by O. Champagne being for putty, paint, &c., supplied by Marine Department for A. Lanctot's house.

Exhibit No. 21—L. G. Papineau's cheque for \$82.60 and made payable to the order of T. Lamontagne.

Exhibit No. 22—Account (receipted) Mount Royal Color & Varnish Co., Limited, amounting to \$81.62 for paint, &c., supplied Department of Marine for A. Lanctot's house.

At the request of Mr. McDougall, K.C., it was ordered—That H. A. Terreault be summoned and required to appear and give evidence before the Committee.

At one o'clock the Committee took recess.

Three o'clock, p.m.

AUGUSTIN PAYETTE sworn and examined and discharged from further attendance.

JEAN BAPTISTE PAGÉ sworn and examined.

During his examination the following was produced, viz.

Exhibit No. 23—Memo. Book of J. B. Page containing entries of the time of Government employees (Painters) who worked on A. Lanctot's house.

Further examination of last-mentioned witness postponed until to-morrow.

The Committee then adjourned until to-morrow (Wednesday) at 10 o'clock, a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

WEDNESDAY, March 22, 1911.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock a.m.

PRESENT.—Messrs. German, Chairman; Barker, Barnard, Brodeur, Bureau, Devlin, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Gervais, Haggart (Winnipeg), Lapointe, Lennox, Maddin, Major, Monk, Rhodes, Roy (Montmagny), Warburton.—(17).

The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed.

J. B. Pagé called and further examination postponed until witness, who was requested to prepare a statement of the actual number of days painters were employed in painting A. Lanctot's house, furnished statement in question.

At one o'clock the Committee took recess.

3.30 p.m.

Arthur Lavallée was sworn and examined and discharged from further attendance.

Oscar Champagne was sworn and examined and discharged from further attendance.

During his examination the following was produced, viz.:—

Exhibit No. 24 Sheets showing the time men worked at Lanctot's house.

The Committee then adjourned until to-morrow (Thursday) at 10 o'clock, a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

APPENDIX No. 3

THURSDAY, March 23, 1911.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a.m.

PRESENT:—Messrs. German, chairman; Barker, Barnard, Brodeur, Bureau, Chisholm (Antigonish), Crocket, Crothers, Demers, Devlin, Geoffrion, Gervais, Haggart (Winnipeg, Kyte, Lapointe, Lennox, Macdonald, Maddin, Major, Monk and Warburton.—21.

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed.

The examination of J. B. Pagé was resumed and concluded, and witness discharged from further attendance.

A statement showing the date and place where men worked was, as requested by the committee, produced and marked as Exhibit No. 25.

The following witnesses, viz., Napoleon Badeau, Joseph Badeau and Joseph Proulx, were sworn and examined, and discharged from further attendance.

Hon. Mr. Brodeur was sworn and examined.

During his examination the following letters were produced and marked as exhibits, viz.:—

Exhibit No. 26. Letter, Hon. L. P. Brodeur to A. Lanctot, dated Dec. 5, 1910, stating that Mr. Lamoureux transmitted him declarations of an important nature.

Exhibit No. 27. Letter, A. Lanctot to Hon. L. P. Brodeur, dated Dec. 6, 1910, acknowledging receipt of foregoing.

Ulric Latraverse was recalled and examined, and discharged from further attendance.

During his examination the following was produced and marked as Exhibit No. 28, being blank form used by foremen to show how work is distributed daily.

The following witnesses were sworn and examined, and discharged from further attendance, viz.: Cuthbert Champagne, H. A. Terreault, A. Cayer and N. Massé.

Messrs. L. G. Papineau, H. A. Terreault and U. Latraverse were recalled, and questioned relative to a summary filed and marked as Exhibit No. 29, showing amount of wages paid to men who worked at Lanctot's house from June to November, 1910, inclusive.

The examination of Hon. Mr. Brodeur was resumed, and concluded.

During his examination he produced departmental file of papers marked as Exhibit No. 30, which included declarations of Henri Proulx and that of Alfred Douaire, both dated Nov. 30, 1910.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

3 o'clock p.m.

A. Thibaudeau, fils, was sworn and examined, and discharged from further attendance.

During his examination the following letters were filed and marked as exhibits:—

Exhibit No. 31. Letter, A. Thibaudeau (Fils) to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, dated January 16, 1911, relative to certain documents he secured from D. Péloquin.

Exhibit No. 32. Letter, Sir Wilfrid Laurier to A. Thibaudeau (Fils), dated January 18, 1911, intimating in reply to foregoing that every facility will be afforded him to place the facts before the public.

A. Lanctot was recalled, and further examined.

The committee then adjourned until Tuesday next, the 28th inst., at 10 o'clock a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1911.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Present:—Messrs. German, Chairman, Barker, Brodeur, Bureau, Chisholm (Antigonish), Devlin, Doherty, Geoffrion, Haggart (Winnipeg), Kyte, Lapointe, Major, Monk, Rivet and Warburton—15.

The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed.

The following witnesses who were summoned and required to appear before the Committee and give evidence were sworn and examined and discharged from further attendance, viz.:—

T. Trudeau who produced a memo marked as Exhibit No. 33 being a valuation of painting, &c., A. Lanctot's house, Joseph Dagenais, Joseph Rivet, who produced a certified account, marked Exhibit No. 34, amounting to \$156.45 for doors, &c., supplied A. Lanctot. E. O. R. Goulet, J. A. Chapdelaine, A. Lussier, A. Lavellee, L. Cardin during whose examination were produced two paylists and account marked respectively as Exhibits Nos 35 and 36 and 37, and Omer Anger. At one o'clock the Committee took recess.

3 o'clock, p.m.

Joseph E. Gauthier was sworn and examined and discharged from further attendance.

Adelard Lanctot was called and further examined.

Mr. Monk moved that the Committee adjourn for the purpose of hearing the evidence of Hermidas Desrosiers required to give evidence in rebuttal. Motion declared lost.

The Committee then adjourned until Thursday next the 30th instant for the purpose of hearing argument of Counsel.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

THURSDAY, 30th March, 1911.

The Committee met at 3 o'clock, P.M.

PRESENT:—Messrs. German, Chairman, Barnard, Brodeur, Bureau, Crothers, Demers, Devlin, Doherty, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Gervais, Haggart (Lanark), Haggart (Winnipeg), Kyte, Lancaster, Lapointe, Lennox, McColl Major, Monk, Northrup, Porter, Rhodes, Rivet and Warburton.—25.

The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed.

Messrs. J. M. McDougall, K.C. and N. K. Laflamme, K.C., having reviewed the evidence the Committee then adjourned until Tuesday next 4th inst. at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

APPENDIX No. 3

TUESDAY, 4th April, 1911.

The Committee met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

PRESENT:—Messrs. German, Chairman, Barker, Brodeur, Bureau, Carvell, Chisholm (Antigonish), Crothers, Demers, Devlin, Doherty, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Gervais, Haggart (Winnipeg), Kyte, Lapointe, Lennox, McColl, Maddin, Monk, Northrup, Rhodes, Stratton and Warburton—24.

The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Brodeur, it was

Resolved, That a sub-committee composed of Messrs. Barker, Geoffrion, Kyte, Monk and the Chairman be appointed to draft the report of the Committee.

On motion of Mr. Gervais it was

Resolved, That Eugene St. Jean be paid for his services as interpreter the sum of \$70.00 being at the rate of \$10.00 per day.

On motion of Mr. Bureau, it was

Resolved, That P. Guévremont, Sheriff for the District of Richelieu, Sorel, be paid the sum of \$9.20 being amount of his account for service of summonses on witnesses who were required to appear before the Committee to give evidence.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Bureau, it was

Resolved, That consideration of the question of the payment of fees to the Counsel representing Messrs. Blondin and Lanctot be deferred until the next meeting.

The Committee then adjourned until Thursday next at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

THURSDAY, 6th April, 1911.

The Committee met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

PRESENT:—Messrs. German, Chairman, Barker, Barnard, Brodeur, Bureau, Carvell, Chisholm (Antigonish), Crocket, Crothers, Demers, Devlin, Doherty, Dubeau, Emmerson, Geoffrion, Gervais, Haggart (Winnipeg), Kyte, Lafortune, Lancaster, Lemieux, Lennox, Major, Martin (Regina), Monk, Northrup, Rhodes, Rivet, Roy (Montmagny) and Warburton—30.

The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed.

The Chairman submitted the Report of the Sub-Committee appointed to draft a report to the House on the matters contained in the Order of Reference of the 6th March last, which is as follows:—

THURSDAY, 6th April, 1911.

The Sub-Committee appointed to draft a Report to the House on the matters contained in the Order of Reference of the 6th ulto. beg leave to report that they have been unable to come to an unanimous conclusion; they therefore submit herewith two draft reports, marked A and B respectively, the former prepared by Messrs. German, Geoffrion and Kyte and the latter by Messrs. Barker and Monk leaving it to

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

the Committee to decide which, if either, of the said draft reports they will adopt as their report to the House.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. M. GERMAN,
Chairman.

‘A’

DRAFT REPORT AS SUBMITTED BY MESSRS. GERMAN, GEOFFRION
AND KYTE.

The Sub Committee of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections beg to present their report on the charges made by Mr. Pierre Edouard Blondin, Member for Champlain, against Mr. Adelard Lanctot, Member for Richelieu, and referred to the said Committee by order of the House on Monday the 6th day of March, 1911, as appears in the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons for the said day:

Your Committee finds that the charges aforesaid have not been established but have been altogether disproved.

Your Committee finds the facts to be that about the end of May, 1910, Mr. Lanctot in the absence of Mr. L. G. Papineau, the Director of the Government Shipyard at Sorel, applied to Mr. Oscar Champagne, time-keeper of the employees there, to be allowed to have some of the men so employed do some of the work of painting and glazing at a house Mr. Lanctot was building in the town. Mr. Champagne assented and during the months of June, July, August, September, October and November, 1910, some ten or eleven different workmen in the employment of the Government did, in all, 217 days work of this character at Mr. Lanctot's house. In September four other men also in the employment of the Government similarly did six days work as labourers at or in connection with Mr. Lanctot's premises. It was agreed that Mr. Lanctot should pay the amount the men were receiving from the Government, and at different times while the work was going on at his house Mr. Lanctot offered to pay the wages of the men so employed, but Mr. Champagne preferred that payment should not be made till the work was finished.

Mr. J. B. Pagé, Government foreman of painters at Sorel, kept a record of each day's work which was done for Mr. Lanctot by Government employees, making his entries each evening and from this record an account was made up by the time-keeper, Mr. Champagne, and sent to Mr. Lanctot by mail on 21st November, 1910. This account shows Mr. Lanctot indebted to the Department of Marine and Fisheries of Canada for 223 days' labour charged at the rate of wages each workman had been paid by the Government and amounting to \$375.62.

On receiving this account Mr. Lanctot paid it immediately by cheque for the amount drawn payable to the Department of Marine and Fisheries or order.

During the course of the work some material consisting of paint, oil, varnish and putty belonging to the Government was, at Mr. Lanctot's request, sent to his house and used there. In asking for this material Mr. Lanctot had promised to replace it later by an equal quantity of like material of equal quality. In setting aside this material for Mr. Lanctot before sending it to him, Mr. Pagé weighed and measured the goods and kept a note of the quantity. In December an equal, or in some cases a slightly greater quantity of the like goods was obtained by Mr. Papineau, the Director of the Shipyard, from the Mount Royal Colour & Varnish Company, of Montreal, and received into stock at Sorel, without charge to the Government, payment for the same

having been made to the Company by Mr. Papineau, and Mr. Lanctot recouped to Mr. Papineau in cash the amount so paid to the Company together with the charges for carriage of the goods to Sorel.

In the opinion of Your Committee the fair and reasonable value of the goods so used, and of the work so done at Mr. Lanctot's house does not exceed the amounts paid by Mr. Lanctot therefor.

Your Committee feel that in view of the very serious nature of the charges made they should express an opinion on the propriety of Mr. Blondin making the charges in the manner he did. Your Committee do not wish to state that Mr. Blondin did not believe there was truth in the allegations, or that he did not act from a bona fide belief in their truthfulness, but the Committee think that before making so serious a charge against an honourable member of the House of Commons, he should have made some independent inquiry to verify the truthfulness of the charges made and, which he apparently did not do. The Minister of Marine was called as a witness. His evidence as to this on page 191 where he says he had information that no fraud had been committed and that all labour supplied by the shipyards had been paid for and all material supplied had been returned and which information he would have been pleased to give Mr. Blondin had he applied for same.

Your Committee think that if Mr. Blondin had made these inquiries he would not and should not have made these charges.

W. M. GERMAN.

VICTOR GEOFFRION.

G. W. KYTE.

'B.'

DRAFT REPORT AS SUBMITTED BY MESSRS. BARKER AND MONK.

Your Committee, to whom was referred certain charges made by Pierre Blondin, M.P., against A. Lanctot, M.P. (Richelieu), beg to submit the following as their report:—

1. In No. 58, Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons of Canada, Ottawa, Monday, 6th March, 1911, the following matters, amongst other things, are to be found, to wit:—

Mr. Blondin, Member for the Electoral District of Champlain, made the following statement from his place in the House:—

I, Pierre Edouard Blondin, a Member of Parliament for the electoral district of Champlain, in the Province of Quebec, Dominion of Canada, declare that I am credibly informed, and I believe that I can establish by satisfactory evidence:—

That in the course of the years 1908, 1909 and 1910, irregularities, abuses, frauds, malversations and robberies have been committed in the shops and stores of the Government of Canada at St. Joseph de Sorel and in the City of Sorel, in the electoral district of Richelieu;

That barrels and tins of paint and other goods of this nature have been illegally and fraudulently taken and carried away from the said stores and shops and transported to the house of Mr. Adélard Lanctot, then and now a Member of the House of Commons of Canada, for the electoral district of Richelieu, which house was then being built on George Street, at Sorel above mentioned, and ready to be painted;

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

That with these goods and paint, paint works, decoration and varnish works, have been done by the employees of the Government of Canada under the supervision of the painters' foreman employed by said Government at the said place, at the Government's expense and during the hours supposed to be devoted to the Government and for which said employees were paid by the Government, these men registering each day as if they had really worked for the Government, and this during weeks and months; the materials and time, thus furnished, are valued at about one thousand or twelve hundred dollars;

That said goods were so fraudulently appropriated to, and said work so fraudulently done at the expense of the Government of Canada for the benefit of the said Adélard Lanctot, then and now a Member of the House as aforesaid, with his knowledge, assent and approval, the said Adélard Lanctot abusively and fraudulently profiting at the public expense and to the public detriment by his position as Member of the House;

I found the belief I have just expressed upon affidavits which I desire to read and produce in support of the motion I am about to make.

Mr. Blondin then moved, That the declarations and matters above set forth be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of this House to inquire fully into the same, with power to send for persons, papers, records and such articles as may be necessary for such investigation, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the Committee do report in full the evidence taken before them and all their proceedings on the reference and the result of their inquiries.

Mr. Adélard Lanctot, Member for the electoral district of Richelieu, read the following statement from his place in the House:—

I must say that I have no objection whatever to the motion of the Member for Champlain asking that the charges he prefers against me as a Member of this House be referred for investigation to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I am glad that he has brought this matter to the attention of the House and I court the fullest and most complete investigation of it.

The facts are simply these: During the month of June last I was building a house in Sorel, and when it was ready to be painted, I had at the time to leave Sorel very frequently to go to Saranac Lake where my wife was lying ill. Not having sufficient time to bring painters to Sorel from any outside place and knowing that none could be had in the town of Sorel, except at the Marine Department shops, and the Richelieu and Ontario shops, I went to the Marine Department to ask the superintendent, Mr. Papineau, to send me a few painters to finish my work. Mr. Papineau being absent, I spoke to Mr. Champagne, the timekeeper, and requested him to send me painters when he could spare them without delaying the work of the Department, and I told him to keep an exact, accurate and separate account of the time of these men while working at my house; at the same time I informed Mr. Pagé, the foreman, that I had asked for painters from Mr. Champagne and that Mr. Champagne would keep the time of the men while they were working at my place. I told Mr. Pagé to get all the necessary materials from Cyrille Labelle and Co., with whom I was dealing and where I had an account current for supplies used in my building.

I also explained to Mr. Pagé that I was leaving for Saranac Lake to join my wife and that I relied upon him to see that the men did their work properly, requesting him at the same time to render me the accounts as the work was proceeding, that I might pay them, to avoid any misunderstanding in the matter. Men were sent at various times between the months of July and November to do this work and during that period, when I asked at different times that the account be rendered to me, I was told that it would be more simple and would involve less work to render the account when the work was finished. The men did the work and when the same was finished, the bill was rendered to me by Mr. Champagne for the Department and I immediately paid it in full upon its production.

APPENDIX No. 3

Some of the paint, varnish and other materials used, were obtained from the shops of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. An accurate account of such materials was kept and goods of the same quality and to the same quantity were purchased to replace the same and the account for the goods so purchased together with costs of carriage to Sorel was paid by me and goods returned to the Department immediately.

And the question being put on the proposed motion of Mr. Blondin; it was agreed to.

2. Under the foregoing statements by Mr. Blondin and Mr. Lanctot, the motion and order of reference accompanying the same, together with the evidence adduced, as a result of the enquiries of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, the following facts were established, viz:—

A. That, from the 3rd June 1910 or thereabouts until the 21st November 1910, certain painters and day labourers employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries at the Government shipyards at St-Joseph de Sorel, were sent to work and did work at the glazing and painting of the house of Adélard Lanctot, a member of the House of Commons—situate on George Street in the City of Sorel—as well as at certain “chores” in and about Mr. Lanctot’s premises—the whole under the direction and supervision of one Jean-Baptiste Pagé, then and now foreman of Government painters, and at Mr. Lanctot’s express request. The men’s names are set forth in Exhibit 2, produced at the Enquiry, being an account furnished by one Oscar Champagne, then and now Government timekeeper, purporting to show the number of days’ work performed with the rate of wages and forming in all a sum of \$375.62.

(See deposition of Adélard Lanctot, M.P., (p. 43), also his statement to House of Commons.

(See deposition of Oscar Champagne, p. 160.)

(See deposition of J. B. Pagé, p. 136.)

B. That from the 3rd June until October 27, 1910, certain putty, paints and materials were obtained, at Mr. Lanctot’s request, by Pagé aforesaid, from the Government stores and particularly from the supplies which had been entrusted to Pagé to be used on departmental works. These materials were carried to Mr. Lanctot’s house and consumed there at painting his house, etc.

(See Exhibit 20, and depositions of L. G. Papineau, p. 119, J. B. Pagé, p. 141.)

C. That there was no authority or permission given to Oscar Champagne or J. B. Pagé aforesaid, by their superior officers, to wit, Mr. L. G. Papineau—director of Government shipyards—or his assistant, Mr. H. A. Terreault—or by the Minister or other competent agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to send men or materials to Lanctot’s house for the above mentioned purposes; and they acted as aforesaid contrary to their duty.

(See depositions of Hon. L. P. Brodeur, p. 192; L. G. Papineau, p. 126; H. A. Terreault, p. 182; J. B. Pagé, p. 140; Oscar Champagne, p. .)

D. That, during the whole period from June to November 1910, no knowledge of the work so done by Government men with Government materials, at Mr. Lanctot’s premises, was had by the Director, the Assistant-Director, the Minister or the Department generally.

(See depositions of Hon. L. P. Brodeur, p. 187; L. G. Papineau, p. ; H. A. Terreault, p. 182.)

E. That the men and materials were obtained by Mr. Lanctot, through the assistance of Oscar Champagne, a timekeeper, and J. B. Pagé, a foreman of painters, in the following manner, viz:—

On or about the 29th May, 1910, Mr. Lanctot went to the Departmental shipyards to see Mr. Papineau, the Director, but not finding him there and not taking

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

the trouble to enquire if he were absent from Sorel, applied to Oscar Champagne to have men from the Government shops sent to do the work of tinting, glazing and painting at his house—and that they would be needed in a few days—telling him that he was in a great hurry and had to take the train in a few minutes for Saranac Lake, and asking Champagne to do this as a favour to him. (Lancot's deposition, pp. 43, 44.) Champagne replied: 'Yes, with pleasure.' Mr. Lancot then met Pagé in the same office or right at the door and told him that he had seen Champagne who would send men to his Lancot's house according as the work would go on (sic.) He, Lancot, had previously spoken to Pagé about paint and materials, to wit, between the 15th and 30th May. (Lancot's deposition, p. 45.) Page lives at about 100 feet from Mr. Lancot's residence and one day he asked him if he could lend him some of his painters in the yards, and look after the work. Pagé answered: 'Yes, with pleasure, if you can get Mr. Papineau's consent.' He also said to Pagé, 'If you can take some paint or some stuff in the Department, will you please be so kind as to keep an absolutely separate account, and in time I shall give back the stuff borrowed.'

(Page's deposition, p. 140.) Pagé swears that his first conversation with Mr. Lancot on the subject was on or about the 20th May, 1910. He never, however, spoke to Papineau or obtained his consent.

(Lancot's deposition, p. 45.) When Mr. Lancot came back from Saranac, he did not go to see Mr. Papineau or obtain his consent, and one man, Octavien Lafrenière, was already at work, putting putty on glasses at Lancot's residence. This must have been in the first week of June because Lafrenière was sent to work on the 3rd June. (See deposition of J. B. Pagé, p. 140.) It also appears by Exhibit 20 that 150 lbs. of putty and 6 packs of glazier paint were sent from the Government supplies in Pagé's hands to Lancot's house, on the 3rd June. (See Papineau's deposition, p. 119.)

F. That the methods pursued by Pagé and Champagne in dealing with the materials and men's time at Lancot's were as follows, viz.:—

No entries were made, nor any account with Lancot kept in any official book or record of the Government; but Pagé says that he kept track of the materials in a private *brouillon* or *blotter* of his own, from time to time, which he put in his pocket or desk, and when the work was done, he used his private memoranda to prepare the account—Exhibit 20. Those memoranda could not be produced at the investigation because, as Pagé says, they have been lost, destroyed or had (mysteriously) disappeared since the time Exhibit 20 was prepared.

With regard to the men working under Pagé's supervision at Lancot's, Pagé, on every Saturday evening, would hand to Oscar Champagne, timekeeper, a slip or list, (merely a private memorandum not entered anywhere in Government books), showing the names of the men and the labour done at Lancot's. Pagé also gave orders to Cuthbert Champagne, custodian of the '*Punch*,' that is to say, the official who keeps the machine in which the men are required, as they go to and return from work, to register on a card in the machine the hour at which they actually go to and return from Government work, to punch and record the time of the men working at Lancot's, as if they were really present and performing work for the Department. This, Cuthbert Champagne did in obedience to the foreman's instructions.

Then Oscar Champagne, whose duty it is also to prepare the pay lists for the fortnightly pay of the men in Government service, falsely entered in the official time books and in the said pay lists—the latter certified and signed by him—the names of the men from the slips handed to him by Pagé, whom he knew to be working at Lancot's, thus representing that the men were actually doing work at public service for which they were entitled to receive pay from public moneys. These slips were kept by Oscar Champagne in his pocket or private desk.

APPENDIX No. 3

In order to obtain the money from the Department at Ottawa, Mr. Papineau, the Director, is obliged to forward the pay list in advance, so certified by Oscar Champagne, whereupon a Departmental cheque is sent to him covering the amount required by the details specified in the pay list at each fortnight. The Director then hands the cheque to Désiré Champagne, the paymaster, and the latter pays the men whose names are on the pay list.

Pay lists Nos. 144 to 155 inclusively were so prepared and certified by Oscar Champagne from 1st to 15th June to 15th and 30th November, 1910, being the period submitted to the Committee relating to the year 1910.

By such means, nobody in the Department but Champagne and Pagé could be aware, or knew or could find out that the men mentioned in Exhibit 2 were working at Lanctot's and not at the Government shipyard. They appeared on the Government pay lists and were so paid regularly; and as long as Champagne kept out of sight in his drawer the time slips given to him by Pagé, it was impossible for the Director or the paymaster to discover that the pay lists were not regularly and honestly prepared; and this went on continuously from early in June until 21st November.

G. That Exhibit 2 was not a true faithful account of the men's time at Lanctot's; and does not contain the full time and labour spent there.

For instance, Alfred Douaire, one of the painters, is inscribed as having worked during fifteen days only, and only in September and October, 1910, whereas in his deposition he swears that he worked at Lanctot's in the months of July and August as well as in September and October, and in all eight weeks or 48 days. At the rate of his wages, \$2.00 per diem, this leaves unaccounted for a difference of thirty-three days, or in money \$66.00 paid by the Government and not repaid by Mr. Lanctot.

Douaire is corroborated by the testimony of Henri Proulx, pp. 65, 69, 74, who says that he saw him at work at Lanctot's in August and at other times during eight or nine weeks; also by the evidence of Albert Thibaudeau, junior, p. 193, who says that on four or five days in August 1910, he saw Douaire at work at Lanctot's and spoke to him there.

Thibaudeau was allowed to go without cross examination.

G. A. Payette also saw Douaire in July or August at work at Lanctot's. (See Payette's deposition, pp. 130, 132.)

So that, upon this point, Douaire's testimony remains unimpeached.

Louis Paul, another painter, is entered for twenty day's at \$1.50, yet Proulx swears that Paul worked for a longer term and produces a paper in Paul's hand-writing stating that he worked at Lanctot's during one month and was paid by the Government. (See deposition of H. Proulx.)

H. The account—Exhibit 20—for paints, &c., does not appear to be exact or full. (Payette's deposition.) No mention is made of paint brushes, pumice stone, steel wool (fil d'acier) although such things were used at Lanctot's, but none of them were bought or obtained from C. Labelle & Co., where Mr. Lanctot had a current account, and Pagé states that everything was got at the Department which did not come from C. Labelle & Co. (See deposition of Pagé, p. 141.) He specifies the only things ordered from the merchants above mentioned and which did not include such articles as above. The following question was put to him:—

Q. All the other paints and materials have therefore come from the Government shops?—A. Yes, sir.

I. That there were other painters at Sorel, not Government employees, who could have performed the work at Lanctot's. Some of these painters asked him for the job, but did not get it. (See depositions of Cartier, p. 55, and Payette, p. 130.)

J. That in April or May 1910, one Amable Lussier, a merchant at Sorel, asked J. B. Pagé for painters from the Government shops, and they were sent to him. These men worked for Lussier some nine days and were paid by him one of them, H. Proulx

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

at the rate of \$2.00 per day. (Lussier's deposition, pp. 205-208.) They must therefore have been instructed not to punch or record their time as against the Government. This method is not that followed in Mr. Lanctot's case.

K. In 1908, certain work was done by Alfred Douaire and G. A. Payette, at Mr. Lanctot's leased premises on King Street. As to this, Pagé says Mrs. Lanctot asked him to do it as a favour, but that he could not do it himself as he was a foreman in the public service and that he always refused to do such things. He, however, sent Douaire. (See Pagé's deposition, pp. 153-154.)

L. That complaints were made to Mr. Papineau generally that men were sent from the shipyards to do work outside. (See Papineau's deposition, p. 123.) And there is evidence of such work done at Lussier's, at the hospital, etc.

M. That declarations in writing by Douaire and Proulx, complaining about the painting of Lanctot's house, were sent to the Minister, who received them on or before the 5th December, 1910, and forwarded them to the member, Mr. Lanctot, asking for an explanation. In his reply, dated 6th December, 1910, the latter, amongst other things, says: 'Mr. Douaire states in his declaration that certain painters of the Department of Marine and Fisheries have worked at my house and have been paid by said department. This is true; but as soon as this work was finished, I reimbursed the department as per understanding with the officers. I did the same with regard to borrowed materials. The whole was paid several days before the filing of those documents.'

* * * * *

but, as a matter of fact, at the date of that letter, the materials had neither been replaced or paid for; and the amount, \$81.60, was only repaid to Mr. Papineau after the 13th December. The transaction of replacing the materials was a personal matter between Mr. Papineau and Mr. Lanctot, in which the government did not figure. Mr. Lanctot had not mentioned the materials in sending his cheque for \$375.62 on November 22nd, for the time of the men set forth in Exhibit 2; and it was Mr. Papineau who suggested the plan by which the materials might be got back to the government stores.

As regards the materials so supplied from the government stores, the account for them, Exhibit 20, is dated 16th November, 1910, and is in the handwriting of Oscar Champagne, yet, although Champagne, on the 21st November, 1910, mailed the wages account to Mr. Lanctot at Ottawa, he did not render, but apparently suppressed, the account for the materials, which account he had already prepared.

And further, when, on the 22nd November, 1910, Mr. Lanctot mailed from Ottawa his cheque for the wages account, he made no allusion whatever to the materials.

(Papineau's deposition, pp. 120-121.) It further appears that when Papineau, on the 23rd November, at Sorel, received that cheque for the wages, he then had no knowledge that any materials had been supplied to Mr. Lanctot, nor did he know anything in relation to the supplying of such materials until some days after the 2nd of December. But several days after the last mentioned date, Champagne brought to Papineau an account of materials supplied to Mr. Lanctot. Thereupon, as Mr. Papineau puts it, 'he had occasion to meet Mr. Lanctot at Sorel,' and he then mentioned to Mr. Lanctot the account for materials.

Mr. Papineau suggested to Mr. Lanctot that 'the best plan would be to have the same quantities of materials returned to the department'—and Mr. Lanctot was quite willing that Papineau should have that done for him.

The fact should be noted that between the date of rendering the wages account by Champagne (21st November) and the delivery of the account for materials by Champagne to Papineau, the formal declarations of wrong-doing had been signed by Douaire and Proulx, dated 30th November, and were in the hands of Thibaudeau and Lamoureux at Sorel. They were also in the hands of the Minister of Marine

APPENDIX No. 3

and Fisheries not later than the 5th of December; and see also Lamoureux's letter of 23rd November to Mr. Lanctot.

M. Lanctot being willing that Papineau should obtain other materials to replace those of the Government, Papineau ordered them from Montreal; they were shipped to the Department on Papineau's account on 12th December, and there is proven Mr. Papineau's personal cheque of that date for \$82.60 in payment for the materials. Mr. Lanctot settled that account with Mr. Papineau by a cash payment. There was neither cheque nor receipt, but Mr. Papineau admits receiving the \$82.60 in cash from Mr. Lanctot.

N. That the rate of wages for painters, at Sorel, would be, on an average, say \$1.85 per diem, whereas the average for Government painters at Lanctot's would be less than \$1.70 per diem; and the operations at Lanctot's would require say 200 to 217 days' work. The actual time of the painters and glaziers is put at 217 days in Exhibit 2, exclusive of 4 day laborers at \$1.35 each, who did 6 days' work, say in all 223 days.

O. That the Government's actual loss, therefore, was:—

On Douaire's wages, 33 days at \$2.00.. . . .	\$ 66 00
On L. Paul's wages, 6 days at \$1.50.. . . .	9 00
On brushes, pumice stone and steel wool, unaccounted for	
On interest on amount in false pay rolls 1-15 June to 16-30 November.. . . .	

P. That Lanctot's profits were:—

In obtaining cheaper labour.. . . .	
In saving cost of getting labour outside if none were available at Sorel.. . . .	
In obtaining services of Government foreman.. . . .	
In difference of Douaire and Paul's wages.. . . .	
In difference of brushes, steel wool and pumice stone	

Q. That the amount of \$375.62 was charged up in detail to the different pay rolls from June to November, as shown by the Journal, p. 397. (See p. 185, deposition of L. G. Papineau.) This was done and could only be done after the 23rd November 1910. This apportionment in detail shows what should have been done at the outset, that is, not to charge in Government books or pay rolls what was not done for the Government, but for Mr. Lanctot.

R. That the transaction with Lanctot was exceptional, says Mr. Papineau at pages 126, 127 and 128. And Champagne, in his absence, was not in a position to hire men, etc. In a very pressing thing, he might let a man go out and do certain work for perhaps a day or so.

By Mr. Doherty:

Q. "But to agree to paint a house?—A. No, he had no authority like that."

Q. "If you had been present yourself and an application had been made to you to enter into an agreement to furnish painters and materials for the painting of a house, would you have agreed to it on behalf of the Department?—A. "...I would require to have good reasons to do it."

Q. "Will you indicate what you would understand by good reasons?—A. Well, cases of urgency or cases of necessity, things like that. In the ordinary course of things, I would not do it."

Q. "And I think no subordinate of yours would have the right to do what you consider you would not have a right yourself to do?—A. Exactly."

S. (Napoléon Badeau.) That Mr. Lanctot was thoroughly aware of such relations of master and servant, appears also by the deposition of Napoléon Badeau, pp. 174, 175, who is superintendent of wood work for the Government.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. "Did Mr. Lanctot go to see you and ask you for some men and did you reply to him that you would send them if Mr. Papineau was willing, and did Mr. Papineau give his consent, and did you send them?—A. Mr. Lanctot asked me if I had what was needed for what he was asking me. I told him that I had not got it at the time, but that it was easy to prepare it. Then, I told him that if he wanted to have what he was asking for, he had to ask it first to Mr. Papineau."

By Hon. Mr. Bureau:

Q. "Did you send some men on that occasion to Mr. ?—A. I beg your pardon, it was previous to that time or later. I sent men, the men were paid by Mr. Lanctot because I had warned the men not to *punch* before leaving. I ordered the men who had charge of the *punch* not to punch their cards.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. "What did he ask you to send?—A. He asked me first to send some wood—me to send some wood. I told him to send some wood he would have to get an authorization from Mr. Papineau."

Q. Did he get an authorization from Mr. Papineau and did you send some wood?—A. That is the last I heard of it."

The above occurred in 1910, while Mr. Lanctot was building his house.

T. That, at Adélar's Lanctot's request, labourers were sent from Government yards to help to remove a telephone pole, which labour he had been asked to obtain by the telephone inspector. (See deposition of Omer Angers, telephone inspector, pp. 210, 211.) These men, Avila Gouin and Adel. Kane, were paid by the Department. (See Exhibit 2.) Was it not possible to obtain day labourers at Sorel to do such work without having recourse to the Government?

CONCLUSIONS.

It is our conclusion from the evidence that Mr. Adélar Lanctot, a Member of the House of Commons, knowingly and unlawfully did procure the employees of the Government of Canada to do certain work for him and on his behalf in the year 1910, he then being a Member of the said House, and by collusion with the servants of the Government did procure the payment of such labour by and out of the public moneys of the Dominion of Canada for his own purposes and benefit, without lawful right and contrary to the public interest.

That he did furthermore, knowingly and unlawfully, cause and procure certain materials, the property of the Government of Canada to be delivered to himself for his own benefit and use, he then being a member of the House of Commons, and with such intent and purpose did collude and contrive with the servants of the Dominion of Canada to whom the said materials had been entrusted for use in the works of said Government to so deliver the same to him by unlawful misappropriation, contrary to their duty and obligation to the Government and contrary to law and the public interest.

An further it is our conclusion that the said Adélar Lanctot, by the acts and proceedings aforesaid, did infringe the independence of Parliament.

S. BARKER,

F. D. MONK.

Mr. Gervais moved that the draft report submitted by the sub-committee and marked 'A' be adopted as the report of the Committee.

APPENDIX No. 3

Mr. Monk moved in amendment, that the said motion be not concurred in, but that the Draft Report marked 'B' be reported to the House as the Report of the Committee.

And the question being put on the amendment, it was negatived on the following division, viz:

Yeas.—Messrs. Barker, Crocket, Crothers, Doherty, Haggart (Winnipeg), Lancaster, Lennox, Monk, Northrup and Rhodes. (10).

Nays.—Messrs. Brodeur, Bureau, Carvell, Chisholm (Antigonish), Demers, Devlin, Dubeau, Geoffrion, Gervais, Kyte, Lafortune, Major, Martin (Regina), Rivet and Roy (Montmagny). (15).

And the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to on the same division reversed.

Resolved.—That the said Draft Report marked 'A' be the report of the Committee and that the same be presented to the House with the minutes of proceedings and evidence attached thereto.

Mr. Monk moved, that in the opinion of the Committee it is desirable that the House should pay proper and reasonable fees to the Counsel who have appeared before the Committee and assisted the inquiry by order of the Committee in this matter and that this opinion be reported to the House without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case.

Mr. Carvell moved, in amendment, that in view of the fact that the question of the payment of counsel fees in this case has arisen, this Committee is of the opinion that it has no jurisdiction to recommend the expenditure of public moneys but that the Chairman be requested to communicate all the facts to the Government for such action as they may deem proper.

The foregoing motion was with leave of the Committee withdrawn.

And the question being put on Mr. Monk's motion it was negatived on the following division, viz:

Yeas.—Messrs. Barker, Barnard, Crocket, Crothers, Devlin, Doherty, Lancaster, Monk and Northrup, (9).

Nays.—Messrs. Brodeur, Bureau, Carvell, Chisholm, (Antigonish), Demers, Dubeau, Emmerson, Geoffrion, Kyte, Lafortune, Lemieux, Lennox, McColl, Rivet, Roy (Montmagny) and Warburton, (16.)

The Committee then adjourned sine die.

Attest,

L. C. PANET,
Clerk of the Committee.

SYNOPSIS OF EXHIBITS.

- | No. | Date. | Subject. |
|-----|------------------|--|
| 1. | Nov. 22, 1910... | Cheque of A. Lanctot for \$375.62, made payable to the order of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.
(Printed on page 35 of the evidence.) |
| 2. | Nov. 21, 1910... | Account of men's time engaged in painting A. Lanctot's house, amounting to \$375.62.
(Printed on page 35 of the evidence.) |
| 3. | Mar. 1, 1911... | Declaration of Alfred Douaire, stating that he had worked at Lanctot's house while in the employ of the Government.
(Printed on page 36 of the evidence.) |
| 4. | Mar. 1, 1911... | Declaration of Henri Proulx, same as foregoing.
(Printed on page 37 of the evidence.) |
| 5. | Dec. 29, 1910... | Declaration of D. Peloquin, same as foregoing.
(Printed on page 38 of the evidence.) |
| 6. | Mar. 1, 1911... | Declaration of A. Senecal, same as foregoing.
(Printed on page 39 of the evidence.) |
| 7. | Feb. 18, 1911... | Declaration of N. Laroche, same as foregoing.
(Printed on page 40 of the evidence.) |
| 8. | Feb. 18, 1911... | Declaration of H. Lambert, same as foregoing.
(Printed on page 41 of the evidence.) |
| 9. | Mar. 5, 1911... | Declaration of Alfred Douaire, same as foregoing.
(Printed on page 42 of the evidence.) |
| 10. | Nov. 21, 1910... | Letter, O. Champagne to A. Lanctot, inclosing account for \$375.62, for work done in connection with latter's house on George street, Sorel, P.Q.
(Printed on page 49 of the evidence.) |
| 11. | Nov. 22, 1910... | Letter, A. Lanctot to L. G. Papineau, inclosing cheque for \$375.62, in payment of men's wages for work done on former's house.
(Printed on page 49 of the evidence.) |
| 12. | Dec. 2, 1910... | Letter, L. G. Papineau to A. Lanctot, acknowledging receipt of foregoing.
(Printed on page 50 of the evidence.) |
| 13. | Dec. 12, 1910... | Account (receipted) of Mount Royal Colour and Varnish Company, Ltd., amounting to \$81.60 for paint, &c., supplied Department of Marine and Fisheries for A. Lanctot's house.
(Printed on page 50 of the evidence.) |

No.	Date.	Subject.
14.		Memo. signed by Louis Paul, stating he worked for one month for A. Lanctot and was paid therefor by the Government. (Printed on page 83 of the evidence.)
15.		Account (certified) of Cyrille Labelle & Co., for paint, &c., supplied A. Lanctot. (Referred to on page 95 of the evidence.)
16.	Nov. 22, 1910...	Letter (original), A. Lanctot to L. G. Papineau, inclosing cheque for \$375.62. (Printed on page 112 of the evidence.)
17.	Jan. 11, 1911...	Cheque for \$375.62, payable to order of Molson's Bank, credit Receiver General, being for refund from A. Lanctot, for labour supplied. (Referred to on page 113 of the evidence.)
18.	Jan. 12, 1911...	Letter, L. G. Papineau to Deputy Minister of Marine, inclosing certificate of deposit of the Receiver General for \$375.62. (Printed on page 114 of the evidence.)
19.	Jan. 16, 1911...	Letter, Deputy Minister of Marine to L. G. Papineau, acknowledging foregoing and requesting statement of labour. (Printed on page 114 of the evidence.)
20.	Nov. 16, 1910...	Account amounting to \$81.30, handed L. G. Papineau by O. Champagne for paint, &c., supplied by Marine Department for A. Lanctot's house. (Printed on page 119 of the evidence.)
21.	Dec. 12, 1910...	Cheque of L. G. Papineau for \$82.60 to order of L. Lamontagne. (Printed on page 120 of the evidence.)
22.	Dec. 12, 1910...	Account (duplicate) of Mount Royal Colour and Varnish Co., Ltd., amounting to \$81.60, for paint, &c., supplied Department of Marine for A. Lanctot's house. (Printed on page 121 of the evidence.)
23.		Memo. book of J. B. Pagé, containing entries of the time of Government employees (painters), who worked on Lanctot's house. (Referred to on page 136 of the evidence.)
24.		Sheets showing the time men worked at Lanctot's house. (Referred to on page 161 of the evidence.)
25.		Statement showing date and place where men worked. (Referred to on page 173 of the evidence.)
26.	Dec. 5, 1910...	Letter, Hon. L. P. Brodeur to A. Lanctot, stating that Mr. Lamoureux transmitted him declarations of an important nature. (Printed on page 178 of the evidence.)

APPENDIX No. 3

27. Dec. 6, 1910...Letter, A. Lanctot to Hon. L. P. Brodeur, acknowledging receipt of foregoing.
(Printed on page 179 of the evidence.)
28. Blank form sent in by foreman to Cost Department for the distribution of the time of the men on the different works.
(Referred on page 179 of the evidence.)
29. Summary showing amount of wages paid to men who worked at Lanctot's house from June to November, 1910, inclusive.
(Printed on page 185 of the evidence.)
30. Departmental file of papers which include declarations of Henri Proulx and Alfred Douaire, dated Nov. 30, 1910.
(Referred to on page 187 of the evidence.)
31. Jan. 16, 1911...Letter, A. Thibaudeau, jun., to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, relative to certain documents he secured from D. Péloquin.
(Printed on page 195 of the evidence.)
32. Jan. 18, 1911...Letter, Sir Wilfrid Laurier to A. Thibaudeau, jun., intimating in reply to foregoing that every facility will be afforded latter to place the facts before the public.
(Printed on page 195 of the evidence.)
33. T. Trudeau's estimate of cost of painting A. Lanctot's house.
(Printed on page 200 of the evidence.)
34. Account (certified) of Jos. Rivet amounting to \$156.45 for for paint, &c., supplied A. Lanctot.
(Printed on page 203 of the evidence.)
35. Pay-list showing names of men employed September 1, 1910, by Jos. Gardin and containing name of Desrosiers.
(Referred to on page 209 of the evidence.)
36. Pay-list showing names of men employed by J. Gardin, who worked at Lanctot's house during week ending September 15, 1910.
(Referred to on page 209 of the evidence.)
37. Nov. 14, 1910...Account of Jos. Gardin for labour supplied A. Lanctot.
(Referred to page 210 of the evidence.)

NOTE.—Exhibits Nos. 15, 17, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 34, 36 and 37 not printed.

INDEX TO WITNESSES

Angers, O.	210
Badeau, J.	175
Badeau, N.	174
Brodeur, Hon. L. P.	178
Do. (Resumed)	187
Cardin, L.	208
Cartier, George.	55
Cayer, A.	183
Champagne, C.	180
Champagne, O.	160
Chapdelaine, A.	205
Dagenais, J.	201
Douaire, A.	84
Goulet, R.	204
Gauthier, J. E.	211
Lambert, H.	101
Lauctot, A.	35
Do. (Recalled)	197
Do. (do.)	213
Laroche, N.	100
Latraverse, U.	108
Do. (Recalled)	173
Do. (do.)	184
Lavallée, Arthur.	157
Lavallée, Alfred.	208
Lussier, A.	205
Massé, N.	183
Pagé, J. B.	136
Do. (Recalled)	173
Papineau, L. G.	105
Do. (Resumed)	110
Do. (Recalled)	185
Payette, A.	129
Pratt, Jos.	94
Proulx, H.	63
Proulx, J. A.	176
Rivet, Jos.	203
Senecal, A.	95
Terreault, H. A.	181
Do. (Recalled)	184
Thibaudeau, A.	192
Trudeau, Isaie.	197

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

(TRANSLATION)

TUESDAY, March 14, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which the charges preferred by Mr. P. E. Blondin, M.P., against Mr. A. Lanctot, M.P., were referred, met at 10 o'clock, am.

Mr. Adélard Lanctot, M.P., sworn:

The witness produced the following documents, viz.:—

EXHIBIT No. 1.

Sorel, P.Q., 22 Nov., 1910.

(La Banque Molson.)

Payez à Dept. Marine & Pecheries ou ordre trois cent soixante quinze $\frac{64}{100}$ piastres, \$375.62.

ADELARD LANCTOT.

Endorsed as follows:—

Department of Marine & Fisheries,
Sorel Shipyd.

For deposit to our credit at Molson's Bank.

(Signed) L. G. PAPINEAU,
M. A. BARIL.

EXHIBIT No. 2.

MARINE AND FISHERIES OF CANADA.

A. LANCTOT, Esq.

DR. to Marine and Fisheries, Canada. P. O. address, Sorel

November 21, 1910.

1910.			\$	cts.	\$	cts.
Juin,	Oct. Lafrenière,	painter	16 jours à 2	00		32 00
Juillet,	"	"	8	2 00		16 00
Aout,	Alberic Letendre	"	18	1 70		30 60
Juillet,	Omer Pagé	"	8	1 55		12 40
Aout,	"	"	9	1 55		13 95
Sept.,	"	"	11	1 55		17 05
"	Adel. Letendre	"	5	1 65		8 25
"	Theod. Emond	"	8½	1 75		14 87
"	Alf. Douaire	"	8	2 00		16 00
"	Art. Trempe	"	11	1 65		18 15
Oct.,	Omer Pagé	"	11	1 55		17 05
"	Arsène Ally	"	7	1 55		10 85
"	Edm. Brault	"	11	1 80		19 80
"	Louis Paul	"	20	1 50		30 00
"	Alf. Douaire	"	7	2 00		14 00
"	Art. Trempe	"	7	1 65		11 55
"	Theod. Emond	"	11	1 75		19 25
"	Adel. Letendre	"	7	1 65		11 55
Nov.,	Edm. Brault	"	13	1 80		23 40
"	Louis Paul	"	1½	1 50		2 25
"	Adel. Alley	"	13	1 55		20 15
"	Omer Pagé	"	6	1 40		8 40
Sept.,	Pierre Ethier, père, labourer.	"	2	1 35		2 70
"	Adel. Desorcy	"	2	1 35		2 70
"	Avila Gouin	"	1	1 35		1 35
"	Adel. Kane	"	1	1 35		1 35
						375 62

(Signed in Duplicate.)

Os. CHAMPAGNE,
Timekeeper.

At the request of the Hon. Mr. Brodeur the following statutory declarations, filed, were marked as Exhibits, viz.:—

(Translation.)

EXHIBIT No. 3.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Alfred Douaire, painter, of the city of Sorel, 51 years of age, solemnly declare:

That I have been in the employment of the federal government at its shipyards situated at Saint-Joseph de Sorel, from January, 1906, inclusively to the 5th of November, 1910, as painter under the orders of J. Bte. Pagé, foreman of the painters department at the said shipyards, during the last two years:—that during these two said years, principally during the last year, and especially in July, August and September, 1910, I have been requested by the said J. Bte. Pagé to go to Sorel, at the house of Mr. Adélarde Lanctôt, M.P., then being built on George street, in order to paint, cement, polish and varnish, &c., &c., the said house and that, as it was well understood, after having registered at the shipyard as present and working on behalf of the government, and my departure each morning was to be from the said shipyard.

That, as a matter of fact, I regularly registered and punched as previously mentioned, and that in conformity with my orders I left the shipyard each working day and went, as above stated, during the months of July, August and September, 1910, to the said Lanctôt house, where I have worked at the painting, varnishing and staining of the said Lanctôt house.

That this work was also done in part by Messrs. Théodore Emond, Edmond Brault, Adélarde Letendre, Albérique Letendre, Omer Pagé, Arthur Trempe, Louis Paul, Adélarde Alie, all painters, employed at the time by the said government, and on the working hours due to the government and each of them having punched at the same time as myself as aforesaid.

That during the time that work was going on, the said J. Bte. Pagé and Adélarde Lanctôt, M.P., were visiting the job from time to time, looking at the progress of the work, Pagé giving orders for having some paint brought from the shipyard and also for the execution of the work, and that, many times to the knowledge and cognizance, and in the presence of the said Adélarde Lanctôt,—this gentleman knowing also where the paint came from and that the work was being done by employees of the government whom he was seeing often and often at work.

That the said Adélarde Lanctôt never spoke of paying these painters, and in fact was not paying them, but they were regularly paid their salaries by the government at each pay day, as if they had worked for the department.

That the above mentioned persons who have worked with me at this painting have given to that work, some four weeks, and others from four to ten weeks.

I positively declare:—That Mr. Adélarde Lanctôt knew at the time that the paint and other goods which were used in the painting of his house, were coming from the said shipyard of the government; 2. That this work was done by the then regular employees of the government who were paid, for the time they were doing that work, by the government itself, and that for that purpose the time of each employee was punched as employee of the government.

On the seventh day of December, 1910, at 10 p.m., Mr. Alfred Lavallée, lumber merchant, of Sorel, came to my house at Sorel, asking me to go immediately to the house of Mr. Adélarde Lanctôt, at Sorel, who desired to see me without fault; I went immediately and found Mr. Lanctôt who was waiting for me and who, after the ordinary salutations, showed me and read me the solemn declaration which I had given

APPENDIX No. 3

spoke to me the following words:—‘Is it you, Mr. Douaire, who gave this affidavit?’ I answered: ‘Yes.’ He added: ‘You have signed it?’ I answered ‘Yes.’ He asked during the said month of December to the same purpose as the present one, and me if I would see Albert Thibadeau and try to lay my hand upon certain papers relating to this affair, which he did not like to see circulating. I answered that it was not easy to get hold of these documents, principally the affidavit dated at Sorel, the 30th of November, 1910. Mr. Lanctôt added: ‘I will look to that myself, and I will try to get hold of them. Mr. Lanctôt wanted me to change my course of action, he offered me a position under the government, which I refused. He told me that if some one was troubled about that affair, principally Mr. J. Bte. Pagé, I would be treated the same way he would be. I answered that I was not afraid. Before leaving, I told him that the affidavit which he had in his hands, and which he got, I did not know from whom, was true and signed by me in perfect knowledge and without any outside influence, as I gave the present one.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of ‘The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.’

ALFRED DOUAIRE.

Declared before me, the undersigned,
at Sorel, the first of March, 1911.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,

Notary.

EXHIBIT No. 4.

(Translation).

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Henri Proulx, painter, of the city of Sorel, aged 34, do solemnly declare:

That I have been in the employ of the Dominion government at its shipyards situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, from February 16, 1909, to November 5, 1910, as painter and under the orders of J. Bte. Pagé, head of the painting department.

That in the course of the month of August last (1910) the said J. Bte. Pagé instructed me to proceed, in company with Omer Pagé and Henri Paul, two government employees, painters like myself, working under his orders to the time, to proceed to the paint shop of the department for the purpose of taking the paint there, the property of the government, and carrying it to the said Lanctôt house at Sorel, with instructions in going through Sorel to follow Augusta street so as to avoid being noticed, as would have been the case had we gone directly to the spot.

That accordingly I proceeded in August, 1910, together with the said Omer Pagé and Henri Paul, to the paint shop, and that there we loaded ourselves with boxes, barrels, and packages of paint neither weighed or measured, as well as of oil and varnish and thence carried our load of wares to the said Lanctôt's house in Sorel, following Augusta street, so as to let people believe that we were coming from the shops in Sorel, in accordance with the instructions received from the said J. B. Pagé; that on reaching the said Lanctôt house we deposited on the floor our three loads of paint, in the presence of the said Adélard Lanctôt, who was then at the said house. There Messrs. Théodore Emond, Edmond Brault, Adélard Letendre, Alberic Letendre, Omer Pagé, Arthur Trempe, Louis Paul, Adélard Alie and Alfred Douaire, all at the time in the employ of the government, as painters, under the orders of J. B. Pagé, their chief, with the knowledge of the said Adélard Lanctôt, who knew these men, who knew where they were supposed to be working, took hold of the paint and utilized it

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

to whitewash the inside and outside of the Lanctot house, while every morning having their cards punched as to get their pay from the government, which as a matter of fact they did get, and this again to the knowledge of the said Adélarde Lanctot who was aware that the government was paying these men for the time they had spent working in his house.

I know personally that morning, noon and night the said Pagé proceeded with me from the Lanctot house to where the punch was located and that he punched on his own account, and that as long as the work lasted. It is also to my knowledge that in the course of the said work, Cuthbert Champagne, another government employee, and keeper of the punch, had instructions to punch on behalf of the aforesaid painters who did not see to it themselves, in the course of said work, at the said Lanctot house, and that indeed he punched once for me before my arrival, stating: your card is punched as well as the others. Besides, I declare that the said J. Bte. Pagé, while I was present, addressed the said Cuthbert Champagne, then close to the punch, and inquired from the said Champagne, keeper of the punch, whether he was careful to punch regularly on behalf of the men working at the time at Mr. Lanctot's. Mr. Champagne having answered in the affirmative, Mr. Pagé declared himself satisfied.

I declare lastly that on the afternoon of the twelfth day, January 6, 1911, I was requested by a friend of Mr. Lanctot to proceed to the latter's office. Accordingly, I went and found there Mr. Lanctot, Mr. Joseph Proulx, of Sorel, and Mr. Napoléon Proulx, of St. Victoire, two of my uncles, and here is what happened: Mr. Adélarde Lanctot, M.P., inquired: 'Mr. Proulx, I heard that you were anxious to get your position; I can have you reinstated provided you sign the paper which I have prepared and which I shall read to you. The gist of the paper he then read, was as follows: Hon. minister, I request that you put aside the statement which I signed on November 10, 1910, which you have in your hands. I signed that paper when in a passion and after thinking over it I realized that some things which I had included had no foundation in fact, and that in the interest of the party as well as in my own personal interest such a course would be preferable, and at the same time I beg to be pardoned by you and by the member.' Having ascertained what use the member Lanctot intended to make of this letter, I answered that it was useless to read any more. 'You should have a better knowledge of the Proulx family; we are not of the kind who sign on Monday and withdraw their signature on Tuesday. I want you to bear in mind Lanctot that all the affidavits declared and signed by me will remain exactly as on the day I signed them.' Then, Joseph Proulx, ticket agent addressed Lanctot as follows: 'You should not have a grudge against my nephew, but instead against those d— fools on the other side whose inspirations you follow.' And the discussion on that subject lasted a couple of hours.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.'

HENRI PROULX.

Declared before me, the undersigned at Sorel, on this 1st day of March, nineteen hundred and eleven.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

(EXHIBIT No. 5.)

I, the undersigned, Dieudonné Péloquin, joiner and contractor of the city of Sorel, do solemnly declare:

1. That I am 34 years of age and that I have never obtained any contract, or favour, or employment from any of the political parties, and that I am independent of them.

APPENDIX No. 3

2. That, to my personal knowledge, during the past five or six months, several men employed in the Dominion government shipyards situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, accused each other of thefts and plunderings of cement, lumber, iron, paint, and especially of time as government employees working for private persons while in the departmental pay; the whole being evidenced by several solemn declarations which have been put in my hands in the course of the last two or three days for the purpose of enlightening me and inducing me to request an investigation.

3. That in the course of November last and of December instant politicians, officials of the department high and low, accusers and accused, have travelled to Ottawa; one of the storekeepers has been suspended, then reinstated as he threatened to tear asunder the curtain which covered many a deed. Finally calm was restored, and it was rumoured that matters would be set right, the accusers giving way as a result of promises of employment, and the accused being compelled to pay back the value of the goods and time received. Hence an unforeseen appraisal for the purpose of determining the value of certain things which parties interested put down at \$292, and which people who have no interest in the matter figure at \$800 or \$1,000, or even as high as \$12,000.

4. That basing myself on the written and oral statements which have been made and communicated to me, and on rumours deemed trustworthy here, I believe that the government, within the last two years, must have suffered a loss of over fifty thousand dollars, through fraud, embezzlement, &c.

5. That to my personal knowledge painters in the employ of the government have painted the inside and outside of the house of our Dominion member of parliament, Mr. Adélard Lanctot, who was aware that such work was being carried on by these men, at his house situated on George street, in the city of Sorel; one of the best finished and the best painted in this city, and the painting of which is estimated at prices varying several hundred dollars.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.'

DIEUDIONNE PELOQUIN.

Declared before me at Sorel, December 29, 1910.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary

(EXHIBIT No. 6.)

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Andronique Sénécal, carpenter and joiner, of the city of Sorel, aged 45 years, do solemnly declare:

1. That I am employed at the Dominion government shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, at the present time, and have been so employed for the last nine years; that on or about the third of May, nineteen hundred and nine (1909), Oscar Champagne, a man in the employ of the same government, in the same place, as time-keeper, summoned me from my work to his office and instructed me to proceed at once to Sorel, to the house of Adélard Lanctot, then in course of construction on George street, that there I would find Lanctot waiting for me and would be told what to do. That accordingly, in compliance with that order from Champagne, I left forthwith, taking with me two ferry tickets, the property of the government, which Champagne handed to me to reach the place of the said Adélard Lanctot at Sorel. On my way I saw Mr. Lanctot at the Hotel Quebec, notwithstanding which I proceeded to his

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

house and waited for him until the following day. In fact, on the following day, I met Mr. Lanctot at his residence about nine in the morning, and told him that Mr. Champagne had sent me to him for some work that was to be done.

Mr. Lanctot then instructed me to work about the house on his property, repairing and resetting the fence which surrounded it; I got to work at once and worked three days in succession without interruption. I was paid by the government for these three days work spent at Mr. Lanctot's; I was working under the latter's instructions and he must have seen to have my card punched by obliging hands, for I was paid in full as usual.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.'

And I have signed,

A. SENECAI.

Declared before me the undersigned
at Sorel on this 1st day of March,
nineteen hundred and eleven.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

(EXHIBIT No. 7.)

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Napoléon Laroche, formerly painter and at present joiner, in the parish of St. Joseph de Sorel, do solemnly declare:

1. That in the course of the winter, spring, summer and part of autumn of last year, 1910, I was employed at the Dominion government shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, as painter and under the orders of J. Bte. Pagé, head of the painting department.

2. That to my personal knowledge, in the course of that year, 1910, a complete staff of painters, then employed, as myself, by the government and paid by the government, was sent to paint, varnish, decorate the inside and outside of the house of Mr. Adélard Lanctot, M.P., for the electoral district of Richelieu, then in course of construction on George street, in the city of Sorel.

3. That, as a matter of fact, Messrs. Omer Pagé, Louis Paul, Alfred Douaire, Théodore Emond, Edmond Brault, Octavien Laferrière, Arthur Trempe, Adélard and Alberic Letendre, all painters employed and paid by the government and on government time, have painted, varnished and decorated the inside and outside of the said Lanctot house, and that with that object in view they worked almost uninterruptedly from about the end of June up to late autumn; work which to the best of my knowledge I estimate to be worth between twelve and thirteen hundred dollars.

4. That these persons registered or cause themselves to be registered as being present and working for the government, since they came up at every pay-day for the purpose of getting their money, and indeed were paid by the government for time which they supplied to a private party.

APPENDIX No. 3

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.'

NAPOLEON LAROCHE.

Declared before me at St. Joseph
de Sorel, on this 28th day of De-
cember, nineteen hundred and ten.

RENE CHAMPAGNE,
C.S.S. for the District of Richelieu.

(EXHIBIT No. 8.)

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned Herménégilde Lambert, of the parish of St. Joseph de Sorel, aged 37, do solemnly declare:

1. That I have been in the employ of the Dominion government at their shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, from 1900 to 1910, inclusive, that is to say ten consecutive years, the first four years as caulker, and the six last as overseer of labourers. I have given up that work on December 28 last, and have not taken it up since, although I have been offered an increase of salary of fifteen cents per day.

2. That while I was thus in the service of the said government, especially within the last three years, Mr. Alex. Gendron, then and still of the labourers' department, head man, and consequently my superior, has often instructed me to send sometimes one, sometimes two and sometimes three of the men under my orders and in my gang to work at Sorel for private parties, especially for Alfred Baril and Oscar Champagne, two high officials at the time, and still in the same department, and for Adélard Lanctôt, M.P., to carry on works and repairs at various buildings.

3. That on receiving these applications, I sent the number of men required to work for the benefit of these persons, and when each foreman was called to give to the head foreman the time of these men, I said to Mr. Alex. Gendron: 'I have one, or two or three men who have been working at Sorel for the above mentioned.' Then Alex. Gendron, when he was present, and Adolphe Joubert, his clerk representing him, when the latter was away, would say: 'Do not mention the absences which go unnoticed; these men have punched and will be paid by the department.'

4. That Mr. Oscar Champagne, employed in the government stores, has had turf taken at St. Joseph's taken to Sorel to grade his property and embellish the grounds around his house at Sorel, which work was done by Michel Lambert and André Cotnoir, men in the employ of the government, who worked between three and four days, while at the same time having their cards punched every morning and getting their pay from the government, at the knowledge of the said Oscar Champagne.

5. That in the course of the summer of 1910, that same Mr. Oscar Champagne caused to be drawn, by government teams and by men in government pay, iron pipes taken from the government and had these carried to Sorel and utilized for a tunnel in a stream going through his property, and that this whole expenditure has been supported by the government, which is the loser in this last instance of about \$200. That to my knowledge instructions have been given to the men entrusted with the drawing of the pipes to do so in such a way that the great Chief Papineau should have no knowledge of it. As a matter of fact, the drawing was effected about seven o'clock in the morning previous to Mr. Papineau's arrival.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

6. That in every instance where time or material was thus embezzled, urgent departmental work was interfered with.

7. That if, to the losses aforementioned, are added those inflicted on the department in the shape of thefts of wood, iron, cement, etc., I may say that these aggregate an enormous amount.

8. I am free to acknowledge that Mr. L. G. Papineau (great chief) of the department, is an honest man, but I will add that either through lack of sternness or some other cause, he finds himself unable to keep in the right path certain subalterns who are not very scrupulous in the handling of the punch. That without the benefit of an investigation for the purpose of finding out those actually at fault, the country will still suffer considerable losses.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

H. LAMBERT.

Declared before me, the undersigned,
at Sorel, on this 18th day of
February, 1911.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

EXHIBIT No. 9.

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
District of Richelieu.

I, the undersigned, Alfred Douaire, painter, of the city of Sorel, aged 51, do solemnly declare that I have been in the employ of the Dominion government at their shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, for several years, especially during the years 1909, 1910, and 1908; that, in the course of the month of October, 1908, J. Bte. Pagé, then employed in the same yards as head of the paint department, instructed me to go and paint the house of Mr. Adélarde Lanctôt, member for the county of Richelieu, at the time and still representing said county, a house which he had rented from Mr. Bruno Leclair, on Roy street, in the city of Sorel.

That, as a matter of fact, following my instructions, I went to paint the said lodgings, then occupied by the aforesaid Mr. Lanctôt, tenant, and did so at the knowledge and in the presence of the said Adélarde Lanctôt, and on government time, as an employee of the said government.

That I was paid in full and without any dockage by the government for the time I had spent painting the said Lanctôt house, and never did Mr. Lanctôt, or any body else on his behalf or in his name offer to pay me a cent for such work effected for his benefit, and which lasted two or three days.

That, besides, Mr. Lanctôt knew that I was then the employee of the said government and that I was drawing my salary from the said government for the work thus effected in his said house.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.'

ALFRED DOUAIRE.

Declared before me, in the city of Sorel,
on this 5th day of March, nineteen
hundred and eleven.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS,
Notary.

APPENDIX No. 3

By Mr. McDougall, counsel for Mr. Blondin:

Q. Mr. Lanctot, you are a member of the House of Commons?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have made a statement before the House of Commons?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which statement is included in the proceedings of the House of Commons, dated March 6, 1911?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In that statement you said, for one thing, that during the month of June you were building a house at Sorel and that, when the house was ready to be painted, you were obliged to leave very frequently in order to go to Saranac Lake where your wife was sick?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you specify in a general way the dates of your trips to Saranac Lake?—A. I can say that since June 7, 1909, I went to Saranac Lake every week. In the month of June, 1909, my wife had been at Saranac Lake for one year.

Q. You go back to 1909, Mr. Lanctot; I had asked you to specify the dates as to the month of June, 1910, during which period you said before the House you were obliged to leave frequently. Can you specify the dates of the trips you made in 1910?—A. I can say that I used to go there every week and spend two or three days, sometimes three or four days, and sometimes I stayed two weeks without coming back to Sorel.

Q. Which period of those trips cover in 1910; which months of the year for instance?

WITNESS.—In 1910?

COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. June, July, August, September. I think that my wife arrived in the month of October.

Q. Your wife came back in the month of October?—A. In the month of October.

Q. You were boarding yourself at Sorel, at which place?—A. I was boarding at Nazaire Latraverse's hotel in 1909.

Q. I confine myself to 1910 for the present.—A. I could not say exactly when I left Latraverse's hotel to go to the General Hospital of Sorel.

Q. For instance, were you boarding at the hospital you referred to since the 20th of June until the 26th of November, 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you have paid your board during that time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. About what time was the house you were building on George street ready to receive the painters?—A. Before painting the house the glazing had to be done, during the month of June or July.

Q. When was the glazing done?—A. I think it was during the month of June—June or July.

Q. I would like you to be a little more specific.—A. They began during the month of June; I do not know when the work was finished.

Q. Try to be more specific, because I am going to bring to your attention the statement you made before the House, in which you said that in the month of June, 'being obliged to leave frequently to go to Saranac Lake, and having had no time to get painters from outside, and knowing that you could not find painters in Sorel except at the Department of Marine and Fisheries and at the Richelieu Company's shops, I went to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.' Was it in the month of June?—A. In the month of June, yes.

Q. If I understand correctly, then you said in your statement before the House that in the month of June you could not find any painters in Sorel or outside, is that what you mean?—A. If you will allow me, I am going to explain it to you in a few words. This is how it happened; during the month of June my house was not ready to be painted inside. On May 29, I think, to the best of my recollection, I went to

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

the Department of Marine and Fisheries to see Mr. Papineau. Mr. Papineau was not there. I saw Mr. Champagne and told him that I needed, in a few days from thence some men to glaze my house and paint it, to do what the painters call 'priming,' I do not know the French word. As the outside work was progressing, they needed some painter to put on the first coat of paint. The men were still at work inside.

Q. Your own employees?—A. The joiners. They were still working at the wood-work inside the house. When I asked him if as soon as men would be wanted to make that primage, and as soon as the house would be ready to be painted, he could send me the men to do the work.

Q. Now, Mr. Lanctot, you say that Mr. Papineau was absent at that time?—A. On the 29th, yes, I think so.

Q. Do you say that he was away from Sorel, or that he was not in the department?—A. I went to Mr. Papineau's office. A young man was there. I asked him where was Mr. Papineau. His answer was, 'Mr. Papineau is absent.'

Q. Did you understand by that that he was not in Sorel?—A. I understood that he was absent,—that he was away from Sorel.

Q. You took no further trouble to ascertain if Mr. Papineau was in Sorel?—A. No.

Q. You then applied to Mr. Oscar Champagne?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was then the employment of Mr. Oscar Champagne in the department?—A. Timekeeper.

Q. He was a timekeeper?—A. Yes, a timekeeper.

Q. For what works?—A. For all the men employed in the shipyards of St. Joseph de Sorel.

Q. Does that mean, for instance, the painters' department?—A. All the men of the department.

Q. Did you find Mr. Champagne?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what did you ask him?—A. I told him: 'I came to see Mr. Papineau.' 'Mr. Papineau is away; I am in a great hurry—'

Q. Is Mr. Champagne's office in the same building than that of Mr. Papineau?—A. Alongside in the second apartment.

Q. Now continue your answer. You said that you asked him—A. I told him, 'I came to see Mr. Papineau; he is away. Will you do me a favour? I am in a great hurry. I have to take the train in a few minutes for Saranac lake. I came to ask him men to work at my house, if he could lend me men to work at my house.'

Q. That was on the 29th of May?—A. About that. Mr. Papineau will be able to tell you. He answered me: 'Yes, with pleasure.' And then I went away.

Q. You did not leave immediately, Mr. Lanctot. You went to see Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé, did you not?—A. I think I met Mr. Pagé in that same office, or right at the door.

Q. In the meanwhile?—A. On the same day, yes.

Q. About the same time?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you speak to Mr. Pagé, and if so what did you tell him?—A. Yes, I told him that I had just seen Mr. Champagne, and that Mr. Champagne would send men to my house according as the work would go on.

Q. You mean Jean-Baptiste Pagé, do you not?—A. Jean-Baptiste Pagé

Q. What is the employ of Jean-Baptiste Pagé?—A. He is the foreman of the painters in the shipyards of the Marine and Fisheries Department, at St. Joseph de Sorel.

Q. Did you say anything about paints or materials?—A. I spoke to him about that before.

Q. To whom? To Mr. Pagé?—A. Yes.

Q. How do you explain that you had spoken before that to Mr. Pagé about paints and materials?—A. During May, I dare say from the 15th to the 30th, after the session of 1910 had come to an end. I saw that I would need painters to finish

APPENDIX No. 3

my house. One day, I met Mr. Pagé—Mr. Pagé lives about 100 feet from my house—and I asked him if he could lend me some of his painters, in the yards, and he would look after the work. Mr. Pagé told me: 'Yes, with pleasure, if you can get Mr. Papineau's consent.'

Q. That was in order to loan some painters to do some painting. I asked you a moment ago if you had spoken to him of painting.—A. Yes; I spoke to him of it. I could not say if it was in the course of the month of May or if it was when I met him at the shipyards, on the 29th of May. I could not say on which of the two occasions it was; I told him: As for the material you shall take it at Cyrille Labelle & Co.'s, where I have an account open. After I had asked him if he could loan me some painters and supervise the work, Mr. Pagé asked me what sort of work I wanted done; I explained to him. Mr. Pagé told me: It is a piece of work as we have none here; there is no other work here as that is.

Q. Mr. Pagé was speaking of the Marine Department?—A. No, no; of my house.

Q. Well, go on.—A. He told me: For the sort of work you wish to have you might find some difficulty in procuring paint here.' I asked him: 'Could you borrow some from the department?' He told me: 'Yes; I think so,' or something of the kind. I told him: 'If you can take some paint or some stuff in the department, will you please be so kind as to keep an absolute separate account, and, in time I shall give back the stuff borrowed.'

Q. Did that conversation take place on the 29th of May or sooner in the month of May?—A. I cannot say so at present.

Q. Did you ever go to Mr. Papineau's after that to obtain his authorization?—A. No, sir.

Q. You never spoke to him of the matter?—A. No, sir. Mr. Papineau lives opposite my house, at about seventy-five feet from me.

Q. After having spoken to Mr. Champagne and to Mr. Pagé, did you try to ascertain if Mr. Papineau had returned?—A. No, sir. I immediately left for Saranac, I only had a few minutes left to take the train.

Q. You were then going to Saranac?—A. I was going to Saranac.

Q. You made a trip of how many days?—A. I could not say.

Q. When you came back from Saranac did you go to see Mr. Papineau?—A. No, sir.

Q. When you returned from Saranac had the department men begun to do the painting at your house?—A. I think there was a man in the attic who was putting in glasses; there was one, Mr. Octavien Laferrière, I think, if I remember rightly.

Q. He was putting in glasses?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please explain what glasses?—A. He was putting putty on glasses.

Q. Was that certain Octavien de Laferrière in the employ of the government?—A. I think he was.

Q. He was not one of the men employed by you?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did he tell you who had sent him to your house?—A. I did not speak to him about that.

Q. You did not speak to him about that?—A. No.

Q. Now, the painting lasted at your house during the months of June, July, August, September and October?—A. No, sir; this is not at all the way in which it happened.

Q. Then explain how it did happen?—A. In the months of June, July, August and September the wood operators were working, and as they were working at the wood outside, in order to prevent the sun from destroying the wood, from destroying the boards, when there was a certain quantity of wood work that had been done, about a man's day's work, they would telephone to Mr. Pagé to send a man on to do the work; to do the priming. In other words as they needed a man to do the painting they would ask Mr. Pagé for one and Mr. Pagé would send on one.

Q. But, is it not a fact, Mr. Lanctot, that seven or eight men were working at the one time to paint your house?—A. Seven or eight men?

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Yes.—A. No, sir; I have never seen that number, sir.

Q. Have you seen three at one time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you seen four?—A. Yes, sir; in the month of September, in September or October.

Q. And even five; you sometimes even saw five of them working at the same time?—A. Well, I never counted them.

Q. The paint work was completed when?—A. On the 21st of November.

Q. Then do I understand you to say that from the month of June up to the 21st of November the Marine Department employees have worked at your house in the months of June, July, August, September, October, November?—A. I think they did. From time to time, one man, from time to time two men. When Mr. Pagé could send on three, he would send on three. When the department would need them he would take them back and I would send them back. This is how the matter went on.

Q. You have employed other painters besides the ones whom the department sent you, for the painting of your house, did you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who were they?—A. One, Mr. Jos. Rivet.

Q. Jos. Rivet of Sorel?—A. Yes, sir. Mr. Rivet is not a painter; it was him who had the contract for making my sashes, doors and frames, and it was him who laid the first coat of paint on all doors and windows.

Q. When did Mr. Rivet finish laying the first coat of paint on the doors and windows?—A. Mr. Rivet made the doors and windows during the winter.

Q. The preceding winter?—A. What? The preceding winter? It was in the winter of 1910.

Q. But it was before the month of May, before the month of April?—A. Yes, it was.

Q. Then he laid the first coat during winter, did he not?—A. I do not know. I did not mind. I suppose so.

Q. Let us understand one another, Mr. Lanctot. Let us see. The men from the department first came in the month of June and they worked until the month of November?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. During that period, did Mr. Rivet do any painting at your house?—A. I could not tell you. Mr. Rivet made the sashes and doors at his own place. Mr. Rivet is a contractor. He has a shop in the town of Sorel. He made the sashes and doors in his own shop, and whenever he brought them he laid the first coat of paint on them.

Q. That was all the painting he did?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you ask Mr. Champagne to give you the account now shown to you and filed before the committee as exhibit No. 2?—A. Between the months of June and November I must have asked him about ten times.

Q. And what did he tell you?—A. He always said, 'I will send it to you later on; the work will soon be completed and I shall send you the whole at one time.' I even offered Mr. Oscar Champagne to give him money to pay the men from time to time while the work was in progress.

Q. Did you give him any?—A. He refused to take any. He would answer me: 'The men will be saying that I am keeping the money; that I am paying them less than you should pay them; something to that effect. I don't want to touch the money.'

Q. Was there an agreement between you and Mr. Champagne as to the price per day these men were to get?—A. The same price that they were earning in the department.

Q. Did you ever go to Cyrille Labelle & Co. to order some paint?—A. No, sir. I know nothing whatever about paint.

Q. Paint, putty, dyes, brushes?—A. No, sir, I never went there.

Q. Did you ever buy from Cyrille Labelle & Co. any materials to enable the government men to paint your house?—A. I believe Mr. Pagé bought some, yes. Personally I never bought any. I did not buy anything whatever.

Q. For the house?—A. Whenever there was anything needed for the house, such as nails, paper or anything else, it was the foreman of my house, the man who had

APPENDIX No. 3

charge of the work, who would go to Cyrille Labelle, or to Mr. Trempe, who would go wherever he liked. I had open accounts in all the stores.

Q. What is your foreman's name?—A. Jean Baptiste Pagé.

Q. The same man? The government employee?—A. For the painters? The painters' foreman?

Q. I am asking you who was your own foreman?—A. Joseph Cardin, a contractor in the city of Sorel.

Q. Was not this Joseph Cardin the foreman for the wood work at your house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had he charge of the painting also?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then let me ask you, did you, either personally or through Mr. Cardin, go to Cyrille Labelle & Co., and buy paints, brushes, putty or other things to decorate or paint your house?—A. I told you I did not. No, never.

Q. Mr. Lanctot, have Cyrille Labelle & Co., or anybody of that firm ever made you pay anything or sent you any account for supplying paint, oil or any thing else for your house during the months of June, July, August, September, October and November?—A. Yes, sir, they have sent me a bill but I have not yet paid it.

Q. Have you that bill? Can you produce Cyrille Labelle's account?—A. I think not, I have asked him to send it to me again. I had this bill from Mr. Cyrille Labelle, but I mislaid it somewhere in my office. I was unable to find it. I phoned him on Saturday to make a new one and to send it to me here.

Q. Did you get from Labelle & Co., some paints for your house?—A. I do not know.

Q. Is it not a fact, Mr. Lanctot, that all the paints, glass, putty, came from the department's shops?—A. I will be able to tell you when I have seen Mr. Cyrille Labelle's account.

Mr. McDougall declares that he will suspend examination of witness on that point, until said account has been produced.

Q. Then, it was Jean-Baptiste Pagé who has been your foreman for the painting of your house?—A. Yes, sir, he had charge of the superintending of the work. Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé used to come in the morning, at noon and in the evening, after his working hours.

Q. It was not you who paid him?—A. Mr. Pagé, I have not paid him.

Q. The other men who worked under him, were they paid by you?—A. What do you say?

Q. The painters who were working at your house, were they being paid by you?—

A. No. It is as I have said to you. I had offered money to Mr. Champagne, but he refused to accept it.

Q. All that you have paid for the wages of the men who went to work at your house is thus included in exhibit account No. 2, produced before this committee?—A. Yes, sir, \$375.62.

Q. Mr. Pagé was one of your friends?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It was a favour that you had asked him?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he was anxious to do you favours, in return for favours received from you, I suppose?—A. He has never received any favours from me.

Q. Since how long are you acquainted with Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé, in the employ of the department?—A. Since I reside in Sorel, since seven years.

Q. He has always been the painter's foreman?—A. No, sir.

Q. Since when is he the painters' foreman?—Since three years, I think three or four years.

Q. When you paid that account, did you find that you had been overcharged?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you made a kind of appraisalment or arbitration in order to estimate the value of the work which has been done at your house and of the paint which has

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

been supplied for your house?—A. No, sir, because I was trusting to Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé, because I knew that he was an honest man.

Q. Was there not somebody who, either on your behalf or for the department, made a sort of estimation of the materials and of the work of the men which had been assigned to your house?—A. I do not understand.

Q. Are you not aware that an appraisalment or a sort of estimation has been made, either by you or by somebody else in order to find out the cost for the painting and the wages of the men who had been working?—A. That is my personal business.

Mr. Laflamme objects to the above question as being too vague.

WITNESS.—Between the government?

COUNSEL.—I have not asked you that. Listen to the question.

(The following question is read a second time to witness):—

Q. Are you not aware that an appraisalment or a sort of estimation has been made, either by you or by somebody else, in order to find out the cost for the painting and the wages of the men who had been working?—A. I do not understand that question.

Mr. Laflamme objects to that question as being too vague and asks that the question be more specified.

Q. I want to know, Mr. Lanctot, if there was not, either on your behalf or by somebody else, an appraisalment or an estimation made of the painting at your house, in which was included the time of the men, in order to arrive at a price which you were to pay to the department?—A. After completion of the work?

been an appraisalment, either formal or express, by yourself or by somebody acting on been an expertise, either formal or express, by yourself or by somebody acting on your behalf, or by others, in order to find out or estimate the value of the work which had been done at your house, and the quantity of materials supplied, in order to arrive at a price which you were to pay to the department?

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Before payment, then?

Mr. McDUGALL.—Before payment.

WITNESS.—Never.

Q. Was there anything done to that effect?—A. Never to my knowledge.

Q. How do you make up that amount of \$375.62, being the face value of the cheque which is now before the committee and marked Exhibit No. 1, signed Adélard Lanctot and which I take to be your cheque?—(Witness examines cheque)—A. This is my signature. I gave the cheque when I received the account from Mr. Oscar Champagne. That's all. I trusted Mr. Champagne to keep the time of the men. I had confidence in him also. There was no dispute over it.

Q. The account, exhibit No. 2, is the original account which you received from Mr. Champagne?—A. It is the original account I received from Mr. Champagne. I think I received the account in duplicate, I am not positive.

Q. If you received the account in duplicate it is an exact duplicate?—A. It is an exact duplicate. At all events it is what I received from Mr. Champagne.

Q. Will you explain, or did you ask Mr. Champagne an explanation of the fact that there are entries for the month of November for this account and after those entries there are entries for the month of September?—A. Mr. Champagne will be able to explain that to you. I did not ask him how it was.

Q. When you received the account did you not draw his attention to this fact?—A. No. All I said was that the account was rather high.

Q. Did you exchange any correspondence with Mr. Champagne or the department concerning the work which was done at your place?—A. No, sir.

Q. No letters, no telegrams?—A. No, sir. I received a letter from Mr. Champagne transmitting me the account.

Q. Have you the letter?—A. I think, yes—a letter from Mr. Champagne, dated 21st of November, 1910.

APPENDIX No. 3

And the following letter is read to the Committee:—

(EXHIBIT No. 10.)

(Translation.)

MARINE AND FISHERIES OF CANADA,
GOVERNMENT SHIP YARD,
SOREL, November 21st, 1910.

DEAR SIR,—Inclosed you will find your account for \$375.62, for work done at your request at your house on George St. If there is some information you wish to have I will be very pleased to let you have it. Hoping that you will find everything satisfactory.

I am, sir,

Yours truly,

Os. CHAMPAGNE,

Timekeeper.

A. LANCTOT, Esq.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Q. I see, Mr. Lanctot, that your cheque, exhibit No. 1, is dated the 22nd day of November, 1910, payable to the order of the department and that it was only accepted in the month of January, the 11th of January, 1911. Can you explain the circumstances?—A. No, sir. From the 22nd of November I never saw this cheque to the 11th of January, the day it was paid.

Q. Was not the cheque held back by you until the 11th of January?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you not asked Mr. Champagne or some other person to keep the cheque till the month of January?—A. Never.

Q. To whom did you give this cheque?—A. I sent it by mail to Mr. L. G. Papineau, director of the ship yard at Sorel.

Q. Have you a letter transmitting the cheque?—A. Yes, sir. That is, I have a copy of the letter.

Copy of the letter is produced as follows:—

EXHIBIT No. 11.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
OTTAWA, November 22nd, 1910.

(Translation.)

Mr. L. G. PAPINEAU,
Director of the ship yard at St. Joseph de Sorel.

DEAR SIR, Enclosed you will find my cheque to the amount of \$375.62 in settlement of your account for wages of the men of the Marine and Fisheries Department who have worked at my house.

Please accept my sincere thanks.

Yours truly,

A.L.

Q. How did you come to send this cheque to Mr. Papineau when you had arranged about this matter with Mr. Champagne and Mr. Pagé?—A. Because the account that was sent to me was made in the name of the Marine and Fisheries Department, Ottawa, and was made: 'A. Lanctot Dr. to the Marine and Fisheries Department of Canada, Sorel.'

Q. Was it the first time at that date, November 21, 1910, you learned that you were doing business with the Marine and Fisheries Department for the painting of your house?—A. No, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Did you not know from the beginning that you were doing business for the Department of Marine?—A. Certainly. I knew that the men of the Department of Marine were working at my place, but not Mr. Champagne's men.

Q. You had not spoken to Mr. Papineau at all?—A. I had not spoken to him. I had spoken to Mr. Champagne.

Q. Did you get an answer from Mr. Papineau acknowledging receipt from your cheque?—A. Yes, sir.

Letter read as follows:—

EXHIBIT No. 12.

MARINE AND FISHERIES OF CANADA,
GOVERNMENT SHIP YARD,
SOREL, December 2, 1910.

Mr. ADELARD LANCTOT, M.P.,
Sorel.

SIR,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter enclosing cheque to the order of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to be applied as per your request.

Yours respectfully,

L. G. PAPINEAU,
Director of Shipyard.

Q. You asked Mr. Champagne for your account repeatedly?—A. At least ten times, sir.

Q. Why did you not ask Mr. Papineau for it?—A. Because Mr. Champagne was keeping the time of the men.

Q. To whom did you ask the account for paints?—A. To Mr. Pagé.

Q. Did he make a bill for it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you got it?—A. Yes, sir. It was sent to Mr. Papineau.

(The account produced and read as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 13.

MOUNT ROYAL COLOR & VARNISH CO., LTD.

VARNISH, JAPANS, OILS, PAINTS, ETC.
OFFICES AND WAREHOUSES, 136 RUE ST. CHARLES-BORROMÉE,
MONTREAL, QUE., Dec. 12th, 1910.

Sold to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Sorel, Que.

5740 150 lbs. putty.	\$0 02	\$ 3 00
6 packs glazier paint.	0 10	0 60
200 lbs. R. M. paint, green.	0 11	22 00
4 gals. D. B. linseed oil.	1 00	4 00
300 lbs. yellow paint.	0 11	33 00
6 gals. rubbing varnish.	2 75	16 50
2 gals. grey paint.	1 25	2 50

\$81 60

No charge.

Received above goods,
ARTHUR LAVALLÉE.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. I do not understand this account, Mr. Lanctot; this account is from the Mount Royal Color & Varnish Company, Limited, of Montreal, to the Department of Marine?—A. This is the account that was sent to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to replace the materials I had got from the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I will explain how it was done: After having sent my cheque to Mr. Papineau on the 22nd of November, 1910—which was Tuesday or Wednesday, I believe—the following Saturday, I think, I came from Ottawa to Sorel. I saw Mr. Papineau at the Department of Marine who told me: ‘You have an account for paints; you had some paint; you had some material from Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé. Here is his account.’

Q. He had the account?—A. Yes, he had the account. He told me: ‘You want to return these goods, do you not?’ I said: ‘Yes, as it was understood with Mr. Pagé.’

Q. At what date did this take place?—A. I could not say exactly at what date. I know it was a Saturday, at all events.

Q. How many days had elapsed from the time you had sent your cheque to the time you had this interview with Mr. Pagé?—A. I do not know. It was the following Saturday or the Saturday after or the fortnight after. I could not say exactly. It was not very long after anyway.

Q. Then it was the following Saturday, or the Saturday a week following?—A. I suppose so. Perhaps I saw him on the street; I do not remember. Mr. Papineau told me: ‘I will send Mr. Pagé’s account. I will give a requisition to get the same quantity and the same quality of material from the factory to correspond with the material you got from the shop.’

Q. I repeat my question. Did you receive an account from Jean-Baptiste Pagé for the paint that was furnished to you?—A. I tell you it was sent to Mr. Papineau. I do not remember having seen it.

Q. Will you, if you please, answer directly to my question and say if Mr. Pagé furnished you with an account?—A. I do not remember. At all events if I got an account from Mr. Pagé, I took it to Mr. Papineau. Mr. Papineau sent a requisition for the same quantity and the same quality to the same factory and the goods were shipped to Sorel and I paid the freight for the carriage of the goods from Montreal to Sorel.

Q. Will you explain, Mr. Lanctot, how it is that on the 22nd of November, 1910 you had settled, according to your statement, with the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the sum of \$375, amount of your cheque for the work done by the men at your house and you did not settle on the same day for the material and paint furnished?—A. It is because I was not to pay for the material. I had borrowed it and I was to return it.

Q. Mr. Jean Baptise Pagé must have kept an account of that?—A. He kept it and gave it to Mr. Papineau.

Q. Had he not given it to Mr. Papineau on the 22nd of November?—A. I do not know, sir.

Q. Why did you not settle the whole bill at once?—A. Because I was here at Ottawa and I had no account for the materials. Being here I said to myself when I go to Sorel I will return the materials. Had I received the account for the 22nd of November, I could not have returned them. I was not familiar enough with paints.

Q. The account which is produced as exhibit No. 13 is dated 12th December, 1910. It seems to be an account sent by the Mount Royal Colour and Varnish Company, Limited, of Montreal, for the sale made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, at Sorel, for goods which are mentioned in the account and for which a sum of \$81.60 is charged?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you pay that amount to that firm?—A. Mr. Papineau paid the factory and I reimbursed Mr. Papineau.

Q. With a cheque?—A. No, sir; with money.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Have you a receipt from Mr. Papineau?—A. No, sir; I did not ask him for one. I paid him with money.

Q. I see on the face of the bill the following words: Received the above goods. (Signed) Arthur Lavallée. Will you explain this?—A. Mr. Arthur Lavallée? I do not know the gentleman, but I believe he is the man who keeps account for all the paints that enter in the paint shop—who keeps account of the paints that enter and the paint that goes out.

Q. You are the bearer of that exhibit. How did it come in your possession?—A. Mr. Papineau gave it to me. When I paid Mr. Papineau he handed it over to me.

Q. Did Mr. Lavallée's receipt appear on the exhibit?—A. Yes, sir. The document was just as it is now. I never altered it.

Q. When did you make this payment to Mr. Papineau?—A. I could not say exactly—after the goods had been received.

Q. After the 12th of December?—A. Yes, probably.

Q. Did you know then that there were affidavits or solemn declarations made by people from Sorel complaining of the fact that certain painting had been done at your house?—A. No, sir. When I paid for the painting?

COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. Perhaps. Perhaps when the paint was replaced but not when I sent the cheque.

Q. You mean that on the 22nd of November you did not know that there were complaints?—A. No, sir.

Q. But on the 12th of December you knew there were complaints?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Coming back for a moment. What colours were used to paint your house?—A. I confess I am no expert in colours.

Q. Did you use certain shades of green?—A. I think yes. The body of the house is green. I do not know what shade, but I know it is green.

Q. They were obliged at the department to mix a special paint for that purpose?—A. I do not know at all, sir.

Q. Did not Mr. Pagé tell you so?—A. Yes.

Q. What did Mr. Pagé tell you about this?—A. When I told him to be very careful and to keep the accounts correctly, Mr. Pagé told me—I will use his own words—that he had weighed a certain quantity of paint, that he had put it in a tub, and that it was understood that that paint was for Mr. Lanctot. He also told me that he had not used up all that paint and that the government had kept about four or five dollars' worth of it for me.

Q. It was a special paint for you; it was mixed in a particular manner for your own use?—A. That is very easy. There is only two colours in my house.

Q. But these colours are of no use in the painting of the vessels of the department, are they?—A. I do not know, sir.

Q. In 1909, you had commenced to build your house?—A. In 1909, yes, sir.

Q. When you were building your house in 1909—we are not now dealing with 1910—did you not have some work done for you at your house by the employees of the Department of Marine and Fisheries?—A. I do not understand, sir.

Q. We shall try and explain, in every particular. When did you begin to build your house?—A. About October, 1909, sir.

Q. Have not some of the men from the Department of Marine and Fisheries been working at your house?

WITNESS.—Woodwork?

COUNSEL.—Woodwork or other work?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Name the men?—A. I remember two: a man named Lavallée—

Q. Albert Lavallée?—A. I will tell you that in a minute.

(Witness looks over some cheques.)

A man named Lavallée and a man named Plante. Alfred Plante and Joseph Lavallée have worked at my house as carpenters and joiners.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Employees from the department?—A. Employees whom I borrowed from the department.

Q. And whom you have paid?—A. And whom I have paid, yes, sir.

Q. By your cheques?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you produce them?—A. I have not all of them.

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to that question, on the ground that the fact which it is sought to prove is irrelevant to the charge into which the committee is now making an inquiry.

No ruling is given on that objection, but Mr. McDougall does not press the question.

Q. Do you know a man named Andronique Sénécal, of the city of Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was he employed in the department in 1909?—A. He probably was.

Q. Or in 1910?—A. He is still employed. He has given an affidavit against me.

Q. Did he work around your house?—A. No, sir.

Q. He never worked at your house?—A. No, sir, not to my knowledge.

Q. He never was sent to your place?—A. I do not know.

Q. Did you ever meet him at the Quebec Hotel, for instance?—A. I do not remember.

Q. Did he not tell you, at the Quebec Hotel, that he was just going to work at your place?—A. I do not remember that, sir.

Q. The next day at about nine o'clock in the morning, did you not meet him at your house?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objected to this question, inasmuch as it does not specify the day which it is intended to mention.

Mr. MCDUGALL withdraws his question.

Q. Did you ever meet Mr. Sénécal, at about 9 o'clock in the morning, at your place?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to that question as being too indefinite and too general.

Mr. MCDUGALL withdraws his question.

Q. During the fall of 1909, did you meet Andronique Sénécal at your house?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects again to that question for the reason above stated.

Mr. MCDUGALL again withdraws the question.

Q. Mr. Lanctot, while you were building your house in Sorel, did not Andronique Sénécal, whom you say you know, an employee of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, work around your house either building fences or doing certain other works?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to that question, inasmuch as the fact which is sought to be proved is not relevant to the charge which is the object of the present inquiry.

The Committee rose at 1 p.m.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

3.15 p.m.

Examination of Mr. ADELARD LANCTOT, M.P., continued.

Mr. MCDUGALL states that in Andronique Sénécal's affidavit an error has been made as to a date, and that instead of 'May 3, 1909,' it should be 'May 3, 1910,' and he begs leave to examine the witness as to the date so rectified.

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to this application. He submits that if there is an error in the affidavit, this error can only be rectified by the party who gave the affidavit, and that until the man who has given the affidavit comes before the committee and declares that he has made a mistake, the committee must take the affidavit such as it is.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I think the objection of the counsel for Mr. Lanctot should prevail. I think that so far as he is concerned, we are bound by the record which is before the committee. If Mr. Sénécal was here and he urged that a mistake has been made in his affidavit, he may be allowed to make a correction; but if the counsel for Mr. Lanctot states that he wants the affidavit to be considered at present as it reads, I think his point is well taken.

Mr. MCDUGALL.—I will suspend the examination of the witness on that point until Mr. Sénécal has been heard.

Q. Mr. Lanctot, in 1908, you were occupying, at Sorel, a house or apartment rented from a man named Bruno Leclair, did you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the month of October, 1908, did you make any repairs or any painting to that house, and if so, did any of the employees of the Department work upon it?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to that question and to any question of the kind on the ground that putting such questions to Mr. Lanctot now, and before the accusers have been heard and have adduced the evidence that they can adduce in support of the charges, would amount to compelling a man to prove his innocence when accused of an offence, which is contrary to all rules of procedure.

Mr. VICTOR GEOFFRION, M.P., supports Mr. Laflamme's objection, and moves that Mr. Lanctot's examination be now suspended until those who have laid charges against him have been heard.

Mr. BARKER remarks that this question had already been discussed before Mr. Lanctot's examination had begun, that it has been decided that the counsel for Mr. Blondin may examine Mr. Lanctot at this stage of the proceedings and that there is no reason to reconsider such a decision.

Mr. MONK speaks to the same effect as Mr. Barker and quotes several precedents where in investigations of this kind the ministers or members involved have been heard at the beginning of the proceedings.

Mr. GEOFFRION's motion to suspend Mr. Lanctot's examination until the persons who have given the affidavits have been heard, being put to vote, is adopted on division.

Mr. BARKER moves that this decision of the committee be reported to the House with the other proceedings.

Adopted.

Mr. LANCTOT's examination was accordingly suspended.

APPENDIX No. 3

GEORGE CARTIER SWORN.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Cartier, you reside in the city of Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Contracting painter.

Q. How long have you been employed at that trade of a painter and contractor?—

A. About a dozen years.

Q. Are you known in Sorel as such?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Mr. Adélard Lanctot, the member for the county of Richelieu?

—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you know him?—A. Since he came to live in Sorel, six or seven years ago, about.

Q. And he knows you also?—A. I think so; at least he has spoken to me several times.

Q. Do you know the house which Mr. Lanctot has built on George street in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Whilst he was building that house did you go and see Mr. Lanctot and ask him for the job of painting the house when the house would be ready to be painted?

—A. Mr. Lanctot himself came to see me where I was working. I was painting a house for Mr. Baril, and I asked him for the job then.

Q. You asked him for what job?—A. The job on the house he was building.

Q. The job that he had to give for his own house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that, sir, at what time of the year?—A. In the month of November, 1909.

Q. How did he answer you when you asked him for the job of painting his house?—A. He told me that he would not give the job without seeing me.

Q. Did he see you again about that and did he give you the job of painting?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did he ever speak to you about it at any time?—A. He never spoke to me about it.

Q. Do you know that he continued after the month of November building his house in Sorel?—A. He suspended the work for the winter, and he resumed the building in the spring.

Q. At about what time in the spring was Mr. Lanctot's house ready for the painter's work?—A. To put down the last coat, in the month of July, about.

Q. And the first coat?—A. Priming was begun as soon as the woodwork was put down. There was a painter following the builders.

Q. Would you have been able to undertake the job of painting Mr. Lanctot's house in the spring or in the summer of 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see what the painters whom Mr. Lanctot employed at his house did as far as painting was concerned?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you give us an estimate or a calculation of the value of the paint work and wages of the men employed at doing the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To what sum do you estimate the value of the paint work, together with the time of the men, for Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I should calculate about nine hundred and fifty dollars.

Q. Would you have taken the job for \$950?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many coats of paint do you reckon in your valuation of \$950?—A. About four coats.

Q. Could you have found men to help you in executing the job?—A. Yes, sir; I had some at the time.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Would you have found men in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are there other painters in Sorel besides you, contracting painters?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you name some of them?—A. Mr. Payette.

Q. Do you mean Augustin Payette?—A. Augustin Payette.

Q. Can you name any others?—A. Mr. Joseph Proulx.

Q. Can you name others?—A. Mr. Telesphore Bérubé or Barbé.

Q. Is there one Mr. Laine, who is a painter at Sorel also?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Whilst Mr. Lanctot's house was building were these painters at Sorel available; could he have hired them to do the job?—A. That is a thing which I cannot say.

Q. Were they in Sorel?—A. They were in Sorel, but I cannot say if they could do the work at the time.

Q. You, during that spring, were available, you would have done the work?—A. Yes, sir, because I had nothing to do at the time.

Q. Do you know who did the paint work at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see the men at work?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you name them?—A. Mr. Douaire, Mr. Emond, Mr. Brault, one Mr. Pagé; two Messrs. Letendre worked there also.

Q. Did you complain, when you saw these men there at work painting Mr. Lanctot's house, because you had not had the job yourself?—A. I complained, certainly, yes, sir.

Q. What complaint did you make?—A. My complaint was that the government was coming to do all our work on the Sorel side; not only at Mr. Lanctot's house, but everywhere in the city.

Q. If I understand you right, you were protesting against the fact that the government was sending men to compete against you painters, in doing work either at Mr. Lanctot's or elsewhere in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Cross examined by Mr. N. K. Laflamme, of Counsel for Mr. Lanctot:

Q. When did you begin to work at Mr. Baril's house?—A. In the month of October.

Q. Of what year?—A. Nineteen hundred and nine.

Q. When did you finish your job?—A. I finished the job in June, nineteen hundred and ten.

Q. Did you work there continuously, from the month of October until the month of June, nineteen hundred and ten?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where is the house of Mr. Baril situated?—A. On George street, I believe.

Q. It is a larger house than Mr. Lanctot's home, is it not?—A. Not much.

Q. A little larger?—A. Not much. I did not measure it. The rooms are about the same.

Q. That means that it is a little larger?—A. I did not measure it.

Q. I am not asking you that; I am asking you if you mean by that that Mr. Baril's house is a little larger?—A. In my estimation it is a little larger.

Q. How much so?—A. I could not say.

Q. You have no idea?—A. I cannot say, no.

Q. Is it a two-story house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many square feet are there in that home?—A. These are details which I cannot give you.

Q. These are not details; certainly you should know that?—A. It is not very necessary for me to know that.

Q. That work you did for Mr. Baril, did you do it as job work?—A. Part of it was so done.

Q. In that case you must have considered some the size of the house?—A. I always considered the size of the house; but not directly in the contract which I took. In matters of doors and skirting no measurements are taken.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Did you paint the partitions?—A. Yes, sir; but this was done by day-work, I think.

Q. How much did you charge Mr. Baril for your work?

The WITNESS.—For the contract which I took?

The COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. One hundred and fifty dollars, for the first contract.

Q. That was for the openings?—A. For the openings and the outside cornice.

Q. One hundred and fifty dollars represent the contract; how much did you charge for the work by the day?—A. Two dollars and a quarter a day.

Q. You have done little; it means that you have done something. What have you done?—A. I have done so little that I cannot tell it.

Q. If you have done little it is a reason why you should remember what you have done. Then tell us where you have worked after the month of July?—A.

Q. You say that you are a good workingman, so that it is very seldom that you are out of work and that must affect you?—A. Yes, yes.

Q. Then, what have you done?—A. I went to Montreal, to Grosbois Island, to get some work. There was no work.

Q. When did you leave Sorel to go to Grosbois Island?—A. About the 10th of July.

Q. How long did you stay at Grosbois Island?—A. I stayed there about four days.

Q. After that, where did you go?—A. I went back to Sorel.

Q. You went back to Sorel about the 15th of July?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From the 15th of July till the month of November, what have you done?—A. I was obliged to work in the coal, sir.

Q. Until which date have you worked in the coal?—A. Since the end of July till the beginning of August. It did not take long, as you see, to unload a steamer.

Q. Now, sir, in your estimate, of \$950, what is your estimation of the work done?—A. I can give you the details, in my own way. According to my figures the glazing costs one hundred and fifty dollars.

Q. I am not referring to the material; I am speaking of the men's work?—A. The men's work would amount to about \$500, between \$500 and \$550.

Q. Do you know how many men have worked at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I have seen about ten men working there.

Q. Do you know how many days they worked there?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you tried to get some information about the number of days they had worked, before you made your estimation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know what kind of paint they used?—A. I could not tell exactly; I know only the paint approximately.

Q. You do not know anything about the quantity of paint used?—A. No, sir.

Q. So that, to put it in a nutshell, you do not know the number of days the painters have worked there, you do not know anything about the quality of the paint and you do not know what quantity was used?—A. No, sir, I do not know anything about it.

Q. And on those three points, the number of days, the quality of the paint and the quantity used, you have not taken the trouble to get the proper information before making your estimation?—A. No, sir.

Q. So that it is more a guess than a real estimate?—A. It is a guess with some knowledge of the work.

Q. A guess with knowledge. It cannot be with knowledge, because you do not know the number of days, the quality of the paint or the quantity used. What do you know, then?—A. I know my own figures.

Q. But on what do you base your estimate, if you do not know the number of days, the quality or the quantity of the paint used?—A. It does not matter. I have figured out approximately how many days it would take me to do the work.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. When the work was done at Mr. Lanctot's, you went in with a tape measure and a yard measure and you started to measure the place?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see Mr. Thibaudeau more than once about that valuation?—A. No, sir; it was the only time.

Q. What did Mr. Thibaudeau tell you, when he asked you to make that valuation? Tell us that. Do not hide anything, Mr. Cartier?—A. From what I can remember, I have no interest on either side.

Q. Answer the question?—A. He asked me what was my estimate of the work done at Mr. Lanctot's.

Q. And what did he tell you apart from that?—A. I could not say exactly.

Q. If you cannot tell us exactly, tell us to the best of your recollection?—A. No, sir.

Q. You do not remember it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did he not tell you to be careful, because you could be called as witness?—A. No, sir.

Q. When you made a report of your estimate to Mr. Thibaudeau, what did he tell you? Was he kind of discouraged or not?—A. He said nothing to me.

Q. Not a word?—A. Not a word. I do not remember that he said anything about it.

Q. You do not remember?—A. I do not remember that he said anything about it.

Q. Do you know if there was any wall-paper in Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. No, sir.

Q. There is none?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are you sure?—A. I am quite sure that I do not know if there is any. I do not know if there is any painting. I made my price approximately for the whole house—the painting or the papering. Either the walls or the papering, a rough estimate, you know.

Q. That is not a very satisfactory answer. What is the total amount you have charged for day-work?—A. My bill was one hundred and three dollars, and settlement was made for a hundred dollars.

Q. So, you painted the whole Baril house for two hundred and fifty dollars?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that was the house which was a little larger than Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, how much money have you lost on that contract—because you must have lost money?—A. I have lost nothing. I have made no big work on my contract; that was because some one has annoyed me in that work; one of the department's workmen, Mr. Pagé, has made me lose forty dollars in that respect. If I had not taken the job at one hundred and fifty dollars, he would have undertaken it himself with the men in the government's employ.

Q. Naturally, you do not like Mr. Pagé at all?—A. I do not hate him.

Q. Even if he would make you lose twice forty dollars?—A. It would be of no use to me to hate him.

Q. How much profit have you made on the contract of one hundred and fifty dollars?—A. I came out of it with wages of about a dollar and thirty cents per day.

Q. Besides the work of painting the Baril house have you done any imitation work?—A. Yes.

Q. A good deal of it?

WITNESS.—Besides the work—

COUNSEL.—In the Baril house have you done any imitation work?

Q. How much have you charged for that imitation work?—A. That work was included in the one hundred and fifty dollars.

Q. Who was working with you at the Baril house?—A. A young man has worked with me, to help me in the outside work and also in some of the inside work.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. What is the name of that young man?—A. Damase Roy.

Q. Does he live in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. After you had concluded the Baril work did you work for a man named Tremblay?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you begin to work for Tremblay?—A. I could not say in which month—in June, I think.

Q. When have you finished working for Tremblay?—A. I must have finished in the same month—in June.

Q. That was not long?—A. No.

Q. How long have you worked for Tremblay?—A. About eight days.

By the Chairman:

Q. In what year?—A. In 1910.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. What kind of work was it you have been doing for Mr. Tremblay?—A. Two coats of paint.

Q. Tremblay has not been satisfied with your work?—A. I believe he was satisfied. It was the paint that was not to his liking.

Q. That means that he was dissatisfied with the whole work?—A. Well, I could not say that he was dissatisfied with the whole work, but he refused me materials. He was obliged to supply the paint, and I refused to accept the paint which he bought me, before witness. He told me: 'You apply that paint; it's all right.' I did so, accordingly, and I was not to blame for that.

Q. That means that Tremblay thought that you were a poor painter, and you thought that the paint he had brought you was no good. That is it, is it not?—A. Before beginning to use the paint I told him that the paint was no good.

Q. And he told you it was good?—A. He told me it was good, and to use it as it was.

Q. He forced you to accept it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then you tried to use it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And after a while Tremblay came and told you that it would not do?—A. That it would not do.

Q. What did he say to you when he declared that he was not satisfied?—A. He told me that there were stains, and that in certain places it was not all right. It was the paint that was turning yellow.

Q. You understood that he was not satisfied with the way you had been doing your work, but he was wrong, that was no fault of yours and was due to faulty paint?—A. It depended on the paint.

Q. But he pretended that the fault was yours?—A. Yes.

Q. The consequence of all that was that he told you to go away?—A. No, sir. He asked me to apply another coat or that he would not accept my work.

Q. Did he ask you to apply a new coat with the same paint he had already supplied to you?—A. With the same paint.

Q. Then, he was maintaining that the paint was good?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But, naturally, he knew nothing about it?—A. It looks like that.

Q. Then you applied your other coat, and he was not satisfied?

WITNESS.—The last coat?

COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. I beg your pardon. I asked him to bring me good paint, or if he could not do that I told him that I would not apply the other coat.

Q. Did you apply that coat of paint which he wanted you to apply?—A. It was another man who applied the other coat, two men from Beauchemin's shop.

Q. At the time, you had quit work?—A. I had quit work. I had not finished, I had some other work to do besides that.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. But paint-work?—A. It was paint-work?; I had to finish the blinds.

Q. Now, is it not a fact that Tremblay has been obliged to get that work done over again, I mean that paint-work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By whom?—A. By Mr. Douaine, the man from Mr. Beauchemin's shop, Philippe Douaine. Once more, he was not satisfied with the work. When he settled with me, when he paid me, he admitted that the paint was no good. It had again turned yellow.

Q. Then, in the month of June, you were busy enough?—A. I had not much work. I usually run more than a job at a time.

Q. After working for Tremblay, where have you worked?—A. At the convent.

Q. When did you begin working at the convent?—A. About the 24th of June.

Q. And you kept on working at the convent until what date?—A. Until about the 5th or 6th of July.

Q. You are a good worker, Mr. Cartier?—A. Pretty good, sir.

Q. You always do your best?—A. Yes, sir, always.

Q. After finishing your work at the convent, where have you worked—because a man like you does not remain idle?—A. I was forced to take a rest, because I had no work.

Q. How long have you rested?—A. I have scarcely worked any in July and August.

Q. You did not do that?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?—A. My principle is not to job.

Q. If you do not know the size of the house, the quality of the paint nor the quantity, nor the number of days, what is the basis of your calculation; what do you rely upon?—A. Even if you should make a mistake of a couple of dollars upon the size of a house; or of a couple of feet that does not matter much about the price.

Q. It is not a question of making an error of a couple of feet, because you did not even measure. Upon what did you rely to come to \$950?—A. Upon my calculation, according to the estimates which I make for other jobs.

Q. To what sum do you estimate the amount representing the glass, upon this total sum of \$950?—A. It is approximate, for the number of panes, it is about what I saw.

Q. How much money do you count for glasses?—A. I have reckoned \$150.

Q. You do not know that Mr. Lanctot bought this glass for his own account?—A. I know nothing of that, sir.

Q. How much do you value the paint?—A. The paint, at about \$225.

Q. That is the point where you make a mistake. You cannot say \$225, nor \$200. You know neither the quality nor the quantity of the paint. What do you rely upon to say \$200?—A. It is about what it takes for the size—these are approximate prices. I am not giving you the exact price, I have not made a special calculation.

Q. Who asked you to make the valuation of that work?—A. Mr. George Magnan asked me.

Q. Are there any others who asked you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who are they?—A. Mr. Thibaudeau asked me to state a price approximately.

Q. Which Mr. Thibaudeau? A. Thibaudeau?—A. A. Thibaudeau—Albert.

Q. He is one of the witnesses present here to be heard at this inquiry?—A. I think so.

Q. This Mr. Thibaudeau is the man who began to get the declarations prepared in Sorel?—A. I could not tell you; I do not know the beginning, sir.

Q. Now, when did Mr. Thibaudeau ask you to make this valuation?—A. On the 27th of December or the 25th or 27th.

Q. Now, on the 27th of December the work was completed and Mr. Lanctot was occupying the house with his family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you go into the house?—A. No, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Then how did you arrange to value the paint which had been done in the house, the imitation and so on?—A. Imitation, there was none, sir, I did not see any.

Q. How did you get at valuing the painting which had been done on the inside of the house?—A. I went there before Mr. Lanctot had gone into the house.

Q. I am now speaking of the official and solemn examination which you made at the request of Mr. Thibaudeau, on the 27th December. Will you say how you proceeded on making this valuation? Was it simply by walking in front of the house?—A. I had an idea of it, because I had been in the house when the work was being completed.

Q. You say that on the 27th you made a valuation; what did you do on the 27th to make that valuation? That is what I desire to know?—A. I took no measurement.

Q. I am not asking you what you did not do; what is it you did?—A. I made an approximate estimate, as I am used to do, according to my custom in so doing.

Q. Where were you when you made this valuation?—A. For the last valuation, I was at my place.

Q. So that on the 27th, when you made that valuation, you did not go out of your house?—A. Not on the 27th. I made no valuation on the 27th.

Q. I thought you had made one. Then it was on the 27th you were asked to make a valuation?—A. Yes.

Q. And you remembered that you had been there in the course of the summer?—A. Yes.

Q. And after reassembling all your remembrances you came upon making a valuation of \$950?—A. Yes, sir, according to my manner of stating a price, under my knowledge.

Q. I suppose Mr. Thibaudeau was present when you made that valuation in your house?—A. No, sir.

Q. He was not far away?—A. Nobody was at my house.

Q. When you gave that report of your valuation to Mr. Thibaudeau, did he ask you any details upon the way in which you had come to that result?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you make an estimate in writing?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did Thibaudeau ask you to prepare that in writing?—A. No, sir. The last estimate which I made, Mr. George Magnan asked me for it on the 10th in the evening.

Q. On the 10th of which month?—A. Of January.

Q. When Thibaudeau asked you to make that estimate did you know the reason why he was asking you to make that estimate?—A. I did not directly know what it was for.

Q. But you knew indirectly what it was for?—A. I always had an idea.

Q. You knew indirectly what it was for?—A.

Q. See, look at me a moment, now; you knew it indirectly?—A. I do not remember if there had been a question of it in my presence. I cannot swear to it.

Q. What is it that they did not speak of in your presence?—A. That there was to be an inquiry.

Q. So that when you made that estimate at the request of Mr. Thibaudeau, you knew that it was to be used as evidence at the inquiry, did you not?—A. Certainly.

Cross examined by Mr. McDougall:—

Q. Mr. Cartier, is it not a fact you said that the first one who asked you to make an estimate was Mr. George Magnan?—A. Mr. Thibaudeau was the first one, I think, I am not sure, I think it was Mr. Thibaudeau.

Q. Mr. George Magnan asked you also to make an estimate?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell us who is Mr. George Magnan?—A. Mr. George Magnan is a barrister from Sorel.

Q. You refer to Mr. Lanctot's partner?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why did he ask you, himself, to make a valuation of that work? Was it to have an approximate idea of what the work was worth?—A. I could not say if it was

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

only to have an idea or to make me lower the price a little. He told me to make the price the lowest one possible.

Q. Can you tell why Mr. Magnan went to see you, and asked you to depreciate, if possible, your estimate and put it as low as you could?

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question. Objection sustained by the chairman.

Q. Has Mr. Magnan told you why he wanted to reduce your valuation or to have you reduce it yourself?—A. He told me that it was a serious affair—how could I say that? Mr. Lanctot was in a bad position with that and consequently I should not overcharge.

Q. Tell us how he came to say that to you?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to that question.

Q. Mr. Cartier, tell us what circumstances induced Mr. Magnan to go and see you.

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to that question.

The objection is sustained by the chairman.

Q. When you made your estimation, did you base it on your experience as a painter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. During the summer, had you seen the men at work and did you see the inside and the outside of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes.

Q. How long since you started to work as a painter?—A. About twelve years. I am a painting contractor since twenty-three years.

Q. How many coats of paint did you put on Baril's house?—A. Two coats in some places; in some others I put four and some others three.

Q. You say that you have worked with a man named Madase Roy; how many days have you worked with that man?—A. I have worked with him about forty days.

Q. The men having worked 213 days to paint Mr. Lanctot's house, do you still say that your estimate of \$950, to the best of your knowledge, is correct?—A. I have figured out 216 days.

Q. Now, Mr. Cartier, was not Mr. Baril's house a brick house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. A wooden house.

Q. Was there much painting done on the outside of Mr. Baril's house?—A. Not much.

Q. And the other one was completely painted outside?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is Mr. Lanctot's house well painted?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you supply the paint for Mr. Baril's house?—A. No, sir, I did not furnish anything.

Cross-examined again by Mr. Laflamme, with the authorization of the Chairman:

Q. Do you mean that if you had had the contract for Mr. Lanctot's house, you would not have been obliged to work 216 days but much less?—A. I have figured out that the work would take about 216 days.

Q. 216 days?—A. Yes. It might take less time, it might take more. One cannot tell exactly.

Q. If he paid for 213 days, are you ready to swear that he did not pay for the value of the work? Are you ready to swear this is not correct?—A. I do not swear it is not correct. I think it is correct.

Examined by Mr. McDougall with the authorization of the Chairman.

Q. At what date did Mr. Magnan go to see and ask you to make the estimate?—

A. On the 10th of March, on Friday last.

By Mr. Doherty:

Q. Must I understand that in your estimate of \$950 you included the materials?—A. The furnitures, sir.

Witness discharged.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX No. 3

WEDNESDAY, March 15, 1911.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock a.m.

HENRI PROULX, sworn.

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Proulx?—A. I live in Sorel.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a painter.

Q. How long have you been a painter?—A. 15 years.

Q. Were you formerly in the employ of the Marine and Fisheries Department?—A. I was, sir.

Q. During what period have you been in the employ of the department?—A. Since the 16th of February, 1909, up to the 5th of November, 1910.

Q. While you were so working in the employ of the government, under whose orders were you working; who was your foreman?—A. I was working under the orders of Jean-Baptiste Pagé, foreman.

Q. Where were you working, in Sorel or at St. Joseph of Sorel?

The WITNESS.—Now?

The COUNSEL.—No, no, when you were in the employ of the department.

A. I was working at the shipyards of the Marine Department.

Q. Is that in Sorel, or at St. Joseph de Sorel?—A. At St. Joseph de Sorel.

Q. In the course of the month of August, 1910, were you sent to the house of Mr. Adelard Lanctot, a member of the House of Commons, then in course of being erected?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under whose orders were you sent to the house of Mr. Lanctot?—A. Under the orders of Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé.

Q. Do you mean, the same Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé, the foreman?—A. Yes, sir. Not to work but to carry some paint.

Q. Say what Mr. Pagé ordered you to do?—A. He told me: 'You shall go to where I have got a job; you shall "punch" before you leave, and you shall go across at the same time as Omer Pagé and Henri Paul are going, and you will help them to carry some paint to Mr. Lanctot's house.' And that is what I did; I went there.

Q. Will you explain to us what you mean when you say that he told you to go and get the 'punch' before leaving?—A. To go and register my time.

Q. What is the 'punch' which registered your time?—A. They are cards which we have and we get our time 'punched' at 7 o'clock in the morning, at five minutes to twelve, then at one o'clock exactly and then at six o'clock in the evening, when another punch is made.

Q. You mean a 'punch' which registers the time at which you are working for the government?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you obliged to get 'punched' three times a day?—A. Four times a day.

Q. Well, before you left on that day, did you get 'punched'?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Before you left?—A. Before I left.

Q. When you came back at noon, did you get 'punched' again?—A. When I came back, I got 'punched' also.

Q. In the afternoon, when you left, did you get 'punched'?—A. In the afternoon, I remained at work in the shipyards.

Q. Then you were ordered to bring paint to Mr. Adelard Lanctot's house; were you ordered to carry anything else to his house?—A. On that day, I carried two cans, cans which I think were supposed to contain some oil and varnish, and a jar of paint.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. When you speak of cans, what were the cans supposed to contain?—A. Either oil or varnish.

Q. What quantity?—A. One gallon each.

Q. And the jar?—A. It was a jar which had contained some putty, which had been emptied, and then they had some paint put into it, and it had been refastened.

Q. How much could it contain, about?—A. About one gallon and a quarter.

Q. That is what you carried?—A. That is what I carried myself.

Q. By whom were you accompanied, you say?—A. By Omer Pagé and Henri Paul.

Q. Did Henri Paul and Omer Pagé also carry paint and oil?—A. They did: That is to say, there was a wooden box filled with some small paint boxes, and a parcel of putty; a parcel which I thought to be some putty, and different other articles, in a box which they carried, the two of them.

Q. When you say that it took both of them to carry it, you mean Omer Pagé and Henri Paul?—A. Omer Pagé and Henri Paul.

Q. They were the two who carried the box?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you, how did you carry your paint.—A. In my hands.

Q. Did you go across the river with those packages, to get to Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you cross the river?—A. In the boat belonging to the foreman, and I got across in company with Henri Paul and Omer Pagé.

Q. When you arrived at Sorel, where did you carry those things?—A. They were carried to Mr. Lanctot's new house.

Q. Had you received any instructions about direction to be followed in carrying those effects at Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell us what were the instructions that you received?—A. Our instructions were to take Augusta street, and to go up by Convent street, and then to retrace our steps to Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. Is that the most direct way leading to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. It is four or five minutes' walk longer, I think.

Q. What do you mean by four or five minutes' walk longer? Do you mean to say that there is a shorter way to reach Mr. Lanctot's house, when you say that it took you four or five minutes more?—A. Yes, there is a shorter way.

Q. Why did not you go by the shortest way?—A. Our instructions were to go as aforesaid, but we cheated them of one street, and we went up by Elizabeth street.

Q. Your instructions were to follow Augusta street, but you skipped a street?—A. That is to say, we did pass, all the same, by Augusta street; but, instead of making the ascent by Convent street, we went up by Elizabeth street, so shortening our walk by a square and a half of a street.

Q. You did shorten of a street the distance leading to Augusta street, but you did reach all the same Augusta street?—A.——

Q. You set off, at first, to go by Augusta street, but you went by Elizabeth street.—A. No.

Q. Well, tell us.—A. We took, at first, Augusta street.

By Hon. M. Brodeur:

Q. You had better name all the streets through which you have passed?—A. That is to say, we crossed in a straight line to Augusta street.

Q. In leaving the river, what street did you take?—A. In leaving the river, we took Augusta street.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. And then?—A. We proceeded on Augusta street until we had reached Elizabeth street, and then we went up by Elizabeth street as far as George street.

Q. Who gave you instructions to take the longest way, and why, and in what circumstances?

APPENDIX No. 3

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to question, on the ground that counsel considers as demonstrated a fact which has not been proved, namely, that witness took the longest way.

After discussion, Mr. Laflamme withdraws his objection.

A. Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé told us to go by that street, so as to avoid——

By Hon. M. Brodeur:

Q. What street?—A. Augusta street—so as to be noticed by following a direct way.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Do you say that you had received instructions to go by Augusta street, so as to be noticed?—A. So as to be noticed, by following a direct way. I cannot explain anything else but that.

(Question is read a second time to witness by stenographer).

A. So as to avoid.

Q. Oh! so as to avoid being noticed?—A. Yes.

Q. So as to avoid being noticed by whom, Mr. Proulx?—A. I cannot say by whom; but, a few days before, I was personally made aware that he had made the same observation to those who had carried the paint, and that he had mentioned the name of the superintendent, Mr. Papineau.

Q. When you arrived at Mr. Lanctot's house, what did you do with the things which you had thus carried?—A. I gave them to the men who were there.

Q. Were you then still accompanied by Henri Paul and Omer Pagé?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did the three of you arrive there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And, all three, did you leave there what you brought?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was Mr. Lanctot himself there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he see you come with those things?—A. I think so; he was there, he must have seen us.

Q. Who are the men who were there when you arrived?—A. They were Alfred Douaire, Theodore Emond, Edmond Brault, Louis Paul, Arthur Trempe, Adéland Letendre, Alberic Letendre, and Adéland Ally.

Q. Who were those men? Do you know them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What were they doing at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Some of them were painting walls, others were varnishing, and a couple of them came to get the paint, saying that they had been waiting after it.

Q. Were they employees of the Marine Department?—A. Employees of the department.

Q. Do you know them to be so employed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did not stay to work with the other men?—A. No, sir.

Q. Omer Pagé and Henri Paul, what did they do?—A. Omer Pagé stayed there to work, and Henri Paul went back to the department.

Q. Have you been paid for the work which you did on that day?—A. I have been paid by the department.

Q. On some other occasions, did you go to Mr. Lanctot's to carry paint or other supplies coming from the government's shops?—A. On two other occasions.

Q. Please tell us what were those two other occasions?—A. On those two other occasions.

Q. What I ask is this: On other occasions than the one that you mention, did Mr. Pagé give you instructions, through Omer Pagé and Henri Paul, to go to Mr. Lanctot's to carry paint or to work?—A. No, sir; but I have helped them, as a matter of good will, because that was on my way.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Who were those employees of the department whom you have helped?—A. They were the same, Omer Pagé and Henri Paul.

Q. What was it that they brought at Mr. Lanctot's house, on those two occasions?—A. They were cans.

Q. Cans of what?—A. I cannot say if it was varnish or oil.

Q. Were those cans closed, sealed or filled?—A. They were cans which were full. They evidently had seen much use; they were old and dirty; I could not see if it was varnish or oil.

Q. Was it one or the other?—A. It was one or the other.

Q. Did you help to carry those things?—A. I carried a can.

Q. Did Omer Pagé carry any?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Henri Paul?—A. Mr. Henri Paul only came to take us across on that day.

Q. He went across himself?—A. It was he who came to take us across.

Q. On arriving at Sorel on these other occasions, where did you go with the things you were carrying?—A. I went to Mr. Lanctot's the member's house, and I gave the can at the door, to Omer Pagé, and let him go in while I went on my way.

Q. Did Omer Pagé go into Mr. Lanctot's house on that occasion?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At what date was that, sir?—A. It was in the month of August. I did not notice the date.

Q. The month of August last year?—A. 1910.

Q. Did you do that on two occasions, besides the time of which you spoke in the first place?—A. On two occasions.

Q. Always accompanied by Omer Pagé?—A. Always accompanied by Omer Pagé.

Q. Did you receive, on these occasions, the same instructions from Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé, as to the road you were to follow to go to Mr. Lanctot's?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did Omer Pagé punch before going?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Cuthbert Champagne?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is he employed in the department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is his occupation?—A. Keeper of the punch.

Q. What do you mean by keeper of the punch?—A. He is the man who keeps track of the punch when the men go and register their time.

Q. When you went there yourself to punch, did you see any others who were punching there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Among others, who did you notice punching?—A. The employees of the department; we were about forty.

Q. Among those you have named there as working at Mr. Lanctot's house did you notice any who punched before starting to go to work?—A. Only one.

Q. Who is he?—A. Omer Pagé.

Q. On the three occasions on which you went with Omer Pagé did you notice him punching?—Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever fail to punch and did you find that somebody had punched for you?—A. Once. There was one time when I had not punched the card.

Q. Who had punched your card?—A. Mr. Cuthbert Champagne.

Q. That was very obliging on his part, but how could he punch your card?—A. He had an order from Mr. Pagé.

Q. Which Pagé?—A. Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé.

Q. To punch the card in your absence?—A. Yes, sir.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Had these orders been given in your presence?—A. Yes, sir. That is, they were given on one occasion. He came and asked—Mr. Pagé—at the moment when the punching was to be done, if Mr. Cuthbert Champagne was to punch the cards of the men who were working at Mr. Lanctot's house.

APPENDIX No. 3

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. And then?—A. Mr. Cuthbert Champagne answered him: 'I have punched all the cards of the men who are working at Mr. Lanctot's.

Q. When you carried the paint to Mr. Lanctot's, in the month of August, with Henri Paul and Omer Pagé, where did you take that paint? From whom, from what employee did you receive it?—A. It was received from Mr. Arthur Lavallée.

Q. Who is Mr. Arthur Lavallée?—A. He is the man who prepares the paints for the department. He is employed in the department.

Q. And it was him who delivered the paint to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When that paint was delivered to you was it weighed or measured on scales?—A. No, sir, not as usual, the paint which we used in the yard.

Q. What do you mean by that? What is the usual way?—A. The usual way is that the scales are in the middle of the shop, and all the paint used for the department is weighed before us. It is taken there and entered in the book alongside. Each man takes his paint and it is entered in the books at the same time on the scales.

Q. That is done in your presence?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On the occasion just mentioned was the paint weighed and measured before you on the scales in the middle of the room?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are speaking for yourself. Was the paint or box which was received by Omer Pagé and Henri Paul weighed or measured on the scales?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were Napoléon or Jean-Baptiste Pagé present when you left on that morning with the paint?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On the two other occasions when you helped Omer Pagé to carry paint or other materials were these articles or paints weighed before you right there on the scales?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Victor Geoffrion, M.P.:

Q. Are you very sure? Do you remember perfectly when you say, no, sir?—A. Yes, sir, only they could be measured, for they were gallon cans—on the two other occasions.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. When you have received opened packages or cans have they ever been weighed, measured for you or for the others?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know who filled the oil cans and the putty boxes or other things?—A. No, sir.

Q. In the month of January, about the Epiphany, did anybody ask you to go to Mr. Lanctot's, and, if so, did you go, and what conversation have you had with him?

—A. On January 6, the Epiphany Day, Mr. Caské said to me: 'My uncle, Napoleon Proulx, wants you to call at once at Mr. Lanctot's office.'

Q. You went there?—A. I went there.

Q. What happened then?—A. As I went in Mr. Lanctot asked me—that is, he spoke to me and said: 'I heard that you intended to be employed by the government.' I said: 'Yes, I spoke to my uncles about it.' My uncles were there.

Q. Who were your uncles that were there? Name them?—A. Napoleon and Joseph Proulx.

Q. From Sorel?—A. Napoleon Proulx is from Ste. Victoire and Joseph Proulx is from Sorel.

Q. Go on.—A. Then Mr. Lanctot said to me: 'It would be difficult for you to get your position because you signed an affidavit against the foreman of the department.' He added that if I consented to send a letter to Mr. Brodeur, the Minister of Marine, asking him to return to me the affidavit I had signed it would then be easier to get me a position, and he read to me the contents of the letter written by himself.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Had he a letter there, prepared and written?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you the letter in your possession?—A. He did not give it to me.

Q. You did not take a copy of it?—A. No, sir.

Q. From memory, can you give us the substance of it?—A. Not from beginning to end.

Q. Approximately?—A. Approximately, yes, I can mention approximately what there was in it.

Q. Give us the substance of it. As near as you can.—A. In substance, I was asking the Minister to return to me the affidavit signed by me; I stated that it had been signed in a fit of passion, and that after thinking it over, I felt that I had stated things that were not true, that I was praying the minister and the member to excuse me, and that I exonerated from all blame those who were mentioned in my affidavit.

Q. Was it Mr. Lanctot himself who had drafted the letter which he was asking you to sign?—A. I believe so; yes sir.

Q. It was he who showed it to you?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Do you believe it or do you know it?—A. It was he who showed it to me.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. In whose interest was he doing that?—A. I do not know what for; he did not tell me.

Q. Now, had you made a solemn declaration of certain facts before that time?—Yes, sir.

Q. About what date?—A. Dated November 30, 1910.

Q. And when you made that solemn declaration were you angry or otherwise influenced?

Mr. Laflamme objects to that question on the ground that if witness has made a solemn declaration it shall be produced.

Q. Do you have with you the declaration you made on the 30th of November?—A. No, not here; it is not here; that is I have it at home; I have a copy at home.

Q. The original, where is the original? To whom did you give the original?—A. To Mr. Omer Lamoureaux.

Q. What has he done with it?—A. He told me that he had come to Ottawa and that he had given it to the Hon. Minister of Marine.

Q. Mr. Proulx, you told us that Mr. Lanctot had prepared a letter that you were to sign before being sent to the minister, in which it was said that you had made your affidavit of the 30th of November when you were angry, etc. When you made the affidavit of the 30th of November, were you angry?

Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question.

Question allowed by the chairman.

A. No, sir.

Q. When that declaration was made—your two uncles were with you when Mr. Lanctot asked you to sign that letter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has a conversation taken place there, in the presence of Mr. Lanctot, in which conversation your two uncles have taken part?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was said?—A. I told Mr. Lanctot: 'Do not read any further, I will not sign that.' Then Mr. Lanctot said to me: 'If you do not like that letter write one yourself as you like and you will give me a copy of it.'

Q. Did you then, on the request of Mr. Lanctot, write a letter to the minister in order to withdraw your declaration of the 30th of November or to modify it?—A. No, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. What did you say then to Mr. Lanctot about that?—A. I told him I was not so anxious to get the position that I would countersign a paper the day after I had written it.

Q. Then, did he make any answer?—A. Yes, he told me that it was in order to get me a position, that he was not doing for me but for my uncle because they were good party men.

Q. Which party?—A. The Liberal party.

Q. Are you a Liberal in politics?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you say: 'I am not going to countersign to-day a letter ——' what do you mean by the word countersign?

Mr. Laflamme objects to that question.

Mr. Laflamme withdraws his objection.

Q. When you say countersign do you mean contradict?—A. I meant that I did not want to say the contrary of what I had signed.

Q. In the month of August did you know a man named Alfred Lonaire, of Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A man named Louis Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Arthur Trempe? Adélard Ally? Adélard Letendre?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know how many weeks or how long they worked at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Exactly, no.

Q. As to Alfred Douaire, do you know how long he worked at Mr. Lanctot?—A. About eight or nine weeks.

Q. Louis Paul?—A. Louis Paul gave me himself on a piece of paper the time during which he worked at Mr. Lanctot's.

Mr. Laflamme, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to the answer to that question as being an evidence of hearsay.

Q. Do not tell us what he told you, but did you see him at work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long, approximately?—A. I cannot tell exactly.

Q. About, approximately?—A. About three or four weeks.

Q. How many days did Arthur Plante work?—A. About two weeks.

Q. Adélard Ally?—A. About the same time.

Q. Adélard Letendre, how many days?—A. Adélard Letendre, he has worked at different intervals.

Q. You cannot precise the time?—A. I cannot precise the time.

Q. Now, Mr. Proulx, which difference do you make between imitate and polish?

—A. To polish, the difference is it takes twice as much time.

Q. Which is the most expensive then?—A. Polish is the most expensive.

Q. Was there any polishing done at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you seen it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, you know the house which Mr. Adélard Lanctot has built?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You saw the painting done there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What experience did you say you had as a painter?—A. Fifteen years.

Q. What estimate would you make for the work and the paint supplied to finish and decorate Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I have examined the work on ten or twelve different occasions.

Q. During the time the work was progressing?—A. During the time the work was progressing.

Q. And after the work was done?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, to the best of your knowledge and of your judgment, and under oath, tell us how much you think that work is worth?—A. I have estimated the work as if I had had to do it for myself, to do the work and I put it to between \$850 and \$950.

Q. That includes the material and the paint, &c.?—A. The material and the paint.

By the Chairman:

Q. Does that include the work also?—A. The work is included.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Do you mean to say that you would take the job yourself for that price?—A. I would take it myself for that price.

Q. Now, in the estimate you have made for the whole work, what amount do you put for the time of the men, for the wages, and what amount for the material, paint, &c.?—A. In my estimate I figured out the time of the men and the material.

Q. What is the difference?—A. I figured out that the time of the men was worth about \$500 and the material between \$375 and \$400.

Q. If you would take the job would you take it for a price lower than the one you have just mentioned?—A. No, sir.

Q. During the spring and the summer of 1910 were there any other painters in Sorel apart from the painters of the department and the painters of the Richelieu Company?—A. Painters able to do the work? There were four—four contractors.

Q. You say there were four other painters in Sorel able to do the work of painting Mr. Lanctot's house during the spring and the summer of 1910?—A. Yes, sir, there were four other painters able to do the work at Mr. Lanctot's, but I do not know if they would have had the time to do it.

Q. Who are those four painters?—A. There is a Mr. George Cartier, painting contractor; Mr. G. A. Payette, painting contractor; a gentleman named Lavoie—

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. What is his first name?—A. I do not know his first name.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Is it Emile Lavoie?—A. Emile Lavoie.

Q. And the fourth one?—A. Joseph Proulx.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Telesphore Berubé, alias Barnabé?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is he a painter in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would he have been able to do the work?—A. I do not think he could have done a first-class work; I have not seen him doing specially good work.

Q. The man named George Cartier, whom you speak of, is he the one who has been heard yesterday as witness before the committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot:—

Q. Do you remember the date, during the month of August, when you carried some paint for the first time?—A. I do not remember the date but I know that it was at the beginning of August.

Q. It was during the forenoon?—A. In the morning, between seven and eight o'clock.

Q. What distance is there from the shore of the Richelieu river, on the Sorel side, going by Augusta street to Convent street, taking Convent street as far as George street, and then George street as far as Mr. Lanctot's house?

The WITNESS.—What distance there is.

The COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. I have not measured it.

Q. This is not what I am asking.—A. Well you were asking for the distance.

Q. I am asking you: what distance is there to the best of your knowledge?—A. Oh, from eye-sight, it is all right.

Q. Don't try any of your cork screwing with me, don't you know, you won't succeed.—A. Nor you either, don't you know.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Answer. You must be astray in your estimate of distances as you are in your approximate estimates of paint work?—A. There is about a quarter of an hour's walk—loaded with paint as we were.

Q. Is there a half mile?—A. There are about 18 or 20 acres.

Q. Now, is Augusta street built on the other side?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it one of the main streets of Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, at that time in the season, I suppose that between seven and eight o'clock, nearly every door is open to allow of fresh air, in the morning?—A. The doors should be open.

Q. Now, is Convent street also built upon on both sides?—A. On one side there is the convent; on the other side there are only private residences.

Q. Now, from the corner of Convent street, is George street built upon on both sides as far as Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If such is the case, how could they upon this distance of 20 acres, hope to avoid the glances of lookerson?—A. Ah!—

Q. It is a difficult matter, is it not?—A. From the orders already given.

Q. It was a difficult thing to avoid being seen?—A. It was not difficult to avoid being seen directly by the people living in the houses; from the orders already given, it was to avoid meeting Mr. Papineau upon that street, at these hours of the day; and upon other occasions to avoid the clerks and merchants of King street, from King street going up, going from Augusta street to George street.

Q. So that the main reason for which Pagé told you to take that by-way was to avoid being met and being seen by Mr. Papineau?—A. There had already been a question of this.

Q. It was to avoid Mr. Papineau?—A. There had already been a question of the merchants as well.

Q. Now, do you know where Mr. Papineau lives?—A. I do, sir.

Q. Is it not a fact that his residence is situate upon George street, opposite Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. About opposite.

Q. At what distance?—A. About 40 or 50 feet going up.

Q. Going down the river, or going up towards St. Joseph?—A. Going up towards St. Joseph.

Q. You went in through the front door?—A. Through the front door.

Q. If it is true that you were endeavouring to avoid being seen by Mr. Papineau, why did you not go in through the hind door? That is what I would have done.—A. It would have been necessary to go through the front in the same way. You had to go through the front the same way. You always had to go through the yard entrance passage. I was not myself anxious to avoid this event.

Q. Where was Mr. Papineau when you carried some material for the first time?—A. I have not seen him; we did not see him.

Q. You do not know if he was in the office at St. Joseph, or if he was in his house?—A. At those hours, I do not believe so. He must have been at his house. It is about that time that he leaves his home to go to his office in St. Joseph's.

Q. How many years have you been working in the painters' shop in Sorel for the government?—A. I worked there from February the 16th, 1909, until November the 5th, 1910.

Q. Did you work in the paint shop for the government in Sorel prior to February 16, 1909?—A. No, sir.

Q. At all events, it was a well known fact that in the season of 1910 you were working for the government?—A. Yes, sir—that is up to the 15th of November.

Q. Is it the same thing as to Henri Paul and Omer Pagé, your two companions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember the dates when you went there on the two subsequent occasions?—A. No, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Did Mr. Pagé see you go on those two occasions?—A. He ordered me to go with Henri Paul and Omer Pagé, but I do not know if he saw me go.

Q. But he did not tell you on these occasions, what road you had to follow?—A. I do not remember.

Q. The first time, you walked on Augusta street as far as the corner of Elizabeth street, you continued from there to the corner of George street, in order to reach afterwards the house of Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But you could not follow that way unless you passed in front of Mr. Papineau's house?—A. It did not matter, so far as I was concerned.

Q. That is not the question. You could not follow that way unless you passed in front of Mr. Papineau's house?—A. No, it is impossible to avoid it.

Q. Did you endeavour to dissimilate yourself when you passed in front of his house?

The WITNESS.—Mr. Papineau's house?

The COUNSEL.—Mr. Papineau's house.

A. No, sir.

Q. Then you did not follow the instructions you had?—A. No, sir.

Q. When you came back to the shop, the first time, did Mr. Pagé ask you what way you had gone?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you tell him?—A. No, sir.

Q. Varnish and oil are reckoned by measure?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Varnish and oil are not weighed, but you calculate the quantity of the same by measuring it by the gallon?—A. By the gallon or quart, no matter.

Q. So that it was easy to estimate the quantity of oil and varnish that you carried with you on the different occasions which you mention?—A. As to oil and varnish, it was.

Q. So that when you observed a moment ago that the material had not been weighed, you meant paint only?—A. Paint and putty.

Q. Now, let us speak about paint. Do you know where Mr. Lavallée took that paint?—A. He took it behind the shop, near the tubs where the department's paint was; only, I did not observe, neither did I ask him, if he had taken it in the tubs. As to the cans of varnish and oil, there was a room.

Q. We are through with them; I am now talking about paint. So that you do not know if the paint which you carried away to Lanctot's house had been before put aside into a tub or into any other vessel?—A. No; only I once observed that he had thinned some of the paint in a jar, in my presence, that he had fastened it and that we left with it.

Q. This means that you do not know if, before you carried this paint to Lanctot's house, the quantity of paint which you carried had not been weighed in any case?—A. Not in my presence, no; it had not been weighed.

Q. But it could have been weighed out of your presence?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who undertakes to weigh the stuff?—A. Mr. Arthur Lavallée.

Q. You were dismissed on the 5th of December?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You did not like that?—A. No, sir.

Q. And especially by reason of the fact that some were being kept on, and you were dismissed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you expressed your opinion in that respect, you did not feel embarrassed in stating so?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You said so?—A. Yes.

Q. What is it you said?—A. On November the 7th, in the forenoon, I met the member, Mr. Adelard Lanctot, in company with Joseph Proulx and Hilarie Proulx, my father, and I expressed my reasons to him.

Q. Where did you meet him on November 7?—A. In his office.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Then you did not meet him, but you went to see him in his office?—A. Yes, yes, I went to see him in his office.

Q. Why did you go there?

The WITNESS.—Why I went there?

The COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. To explain to him the reasons I had to give him, to ask him if he had any returns against me; to know for what reason I had been dismissed; that I was a liberal and that there were no returns against me; that I had a certificate from Mr. Papineau. I asked him if I could be reinstated—He told me he was going to see to it.

(A pause).

Q. Go on?—A. I do not exactly remember the rest. I took no notes of that interview.

Q. You are very sure, you said nothing else?—A. Oh I may have said something else which I do not recollect.

Q. I shall help you. Did you not tell him it was a shame to dismiss good Grits as you were, while some Tories were being kept on?—A. I know I told him; I do not know if it was on the occasion of that interview or on some other occasion; because I met the member on several occasions.

Q. You told him what?—A. I told him I did not know why I had been dismissed, being a good Liberal one whose family was all Liberal, when they had kept on Tories.

Q. Did you mention to Mr. Lanctot the names of the men who had been retained?—A. Yes, sir—He asked me: 'Who are the people that you speak of?' I told him—I gave him a list of a few names I had.

Q. Which names did you give him?—A. I do not remember at all, I have not the list of the names with me.

Q.—Mention a few of them?

Mr. McDougall, K.C., objects to this question as tending to prove a fact which is foreign to the inquiry and useless.

The chairman pointed out that since the beginning of the enquiry, many things have been proved which have no bearing at all on the subject matter of the inquiry, and he prays that the counsel be so kind as to limit their questions to the facts pertaining to the inquiry.

Q. Now, Mr. Proulx, are you able to swear that the men whom you saw working at the Lanctot house worked a longer time than the time which is mentioned in that exhibit.

Mr. McDougall objects to the question and submits that Mr. Laflamme should limit his question to the names which the witness has mentioned in his evidence.

Mr. Laflamme mentions that his end is to establish the value of the work.

The CHAIRMAN overrules the objection.

(The witness reads from the list of men.)

A. Mr. Octavien Lafreniere, I have had no occasion, as to him, to see the time he put in.

Mr. Alberic Letendre: eighteen days, that is about right.

Q. As to the first name, you know nothing?—A. No. Omer Pagé, to my personal knowledge worked a longer time than that.

Q. A longer time than what?—A. Longer than eight days.

Q. Do you not observe that the name of Omer Pagé is mentioned in more than one place? Look down as far as the end?—

(The witness again examines the list.)

—A. Yes, it is right.

As to Alberic Letendre, also. I shall resume my examination.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Let us look at Omer Pagé's case. How many days did Omer Pagé work, according to that statement? You thought it was nine days, but it is a little more, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. How many days?—

(The witness reckons the number of days within the list as to Omer Pagé.)

—A. Forty-five days, that is about right.

Q. Now, take Adéland Letendre—

(The witness makes the same reckoning as to Adéland Letendre.)

Q. Adéland Letendre, how many days did he work?—A. Twelve days.

Q. I suppose this is right?—A. Adéland Letendre, to my knowledge, worked more than that.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. More than the number of days mentioned in that statement?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. What brings you to say that he worked more than twelve days? Is it an opinion, or are you sure of it?—A. It is because he left, in my presence to go and work there more often than that; and even I saw him at work.

Q. So that, because you thought that he left more than twelve times to go and work at Mr. Lanctot's house, you think that he worked there more than twelve days?—A. I mean that I saw him working; and I saw him leave, in my presence, several times to go and work there.

Q. Can you swear, sir, that you have seen Adéland Letendre working at the Lanctot house more than twelve days? I am not speaking of his intentions when he was leaving in the morning, but do you swear that you have seen him work more than twelve days?

WITNESS.—To have seen him myself work more than twelve days?

COUNSEL.—Yes?

A. Ah, I cannot swear that.

Q. That number of days could then be exact, you do not know?—A. It might be exact, but in my opinion I thought that he had worked much more than that.

Q. Now, take Theodule Emond. How many days has he worked, calculating from this list?

(Witness calculates number of days indicated on the list.)

A. Nineteen and a half.

Q. Is that exact?—A. It is about exact.

Q. What is the following name?—A. Alfred Douaire.

Q. What about that one?

(Witness makes some calculations about that one.)

A. Fifteen and a half.

Q. Is that exact?—A.

Q. That is about exact, is it not?—A. (After a moment's reflection.) He has worked longer than that.

Q. Have you seen him yourself work more than fifteen days and a half?—A. I have seen him myself work longer than that, and he has himself told me—

Q. What did you stop for at Mr. Lanctot's house every day at noon and in the evening at five o'clock?—A. I had orders of Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé to go across with Omer Pagé, who was working. On other occasions, when Omer Pagé was gone—that is to say, I always stopped to see if he was there to work with me. When he was there, we used to go across together, so as to have only one boat's trip.

Q. We will suspend your examination on that point until adjournment. The prices mentioned in this bill are the ordinary prices paid to painters in Sorel?—A.

APPENDIX No. 3

They come very near the ordinary prices which are paid, except in the case of Edmond Brault. I always thought that he was receiving a dollar and ninety cents.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. And for what amount is he down on the list?—A. A dollar and eighty cents.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Now, are you in a position to swear that there are other painters than those mentioned on this list, and who were in the employ of the government, who did work at Mr. Lanctot's house? Look at the names on the list. Are there others?

(Witness has a long look at the list.)

Q. It takes you a good deal of time?—A. Those who are mentioned have done some work.

Q. That is not what I asked you. Are you in a position to swear that other painters in the employ of the government have been working at the Lanctot house during the period mentioned in the statement which you hold in your hands, besides those mentioned in that statement?—A. Not in my presence.

Q. If you know nothing about the measure of the oil and the varnish, nor about the weight of the paint, how do you explain that you can have made a bill of three hundred and seventy-five to four hundred dollars? Have you dreamt that?—A. For the materials.

Q. Yes?—A. I have enough experience in painting after looking at a room in an ordinary house, like Mr. Lanctot's house, to know how much paint would be necessary for the walls, each coat, reckoning upon the quality of the walls, and for the wood, the wood-work, it is the same thing.

Q. Do you know how many coats of paint have been put in the house?—A. They have given a size coat in my presence. That, I know very well. They have given two coats of paint in my presence, of which I am aware, on the walls.

Q. You have never measured the apartments?—A. No, sir.

Q. You know nothing, neither, about the size of the house?—A. No, sir.

Q. And, to arrive at an exact figure, it would be necessary to consider the size of the apartments, the divisions, the ceilings, is it not?—A. It is not necessary.

Q. It is not necessary for you?—A. No.

Q. Do you know if any of the rooms of the house had been papered?—A. Upstairs.

Q. How many rooms, up-stairs, have been papered?—A. I had taken a memorandum of that, but I haven't got it on hand. I have taken note of everything, the rooms.

Q. How many rooms are there up-stairs?—A. I am sure—Well, I am sure, I could not swear to that, because I have not the memorandum on hand, but there are three or four rooms papered up-stairs.

Q. You would have taken that job, yourself, for eight hundred and fifty dollars?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Naturally, you would have made a profit on the execution of the work?—A. It would have been a pretty close price to make a living out of it.

Q. What proportion of profit could you have realized on a contract like that one, on a basis of eight hundred and fifty dollars?—A.—

Q. I will help you. Thirty five per cent?—A. Thirty five per cent on the amount?

Q. On the total amount. That is, pretty good, is it not?—A. Oh, about twenty to twenty five per cent.

Q. That would make two hundred and twelve dollars, about that?—A. There, I mean with the men, the pay of the men, and my salary besides. That is to say, I would have made a profit of about twenty per cent from twenty to twenty-five per cent.

Q. That would reduce the value of the material and the value of the labour to six hundred and thirty-six dollars?—A. I am speaking of the material. I am calculating the material at cost price.

Q. So, the profit of two hundred and twelve dollars, that was the profit on the wages of the men?—A. The profit that I was calculating to take, from twenty to twenty-five per cent, that was on the employees.

Q. Do you know if, besides the paint-work which has been done, not by the men of the shop, Mr. Lanctot had had work of that kind done in his house by some other men of Sorel?—A. By other men than those of the shop?

Q. Yes?—A. Paint-work?

Q. Yes.—A. I have not seen any other work done.

Q. You do not know?—A. No.

Q. Do you know Mr. Rivet?—A. What is his first name?

Q. Jos. Rivet.—A. Mr. Jos. Rivet, yes, sir.

Q. Have you seen him working at the house?—A. I have not seen him work at the house.

Q. On November 30, you say that they made you sign a declaration?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you then obeying the dictates of your conscience, or had you been asked to sign that?—A. In the beginning, I had myself taken a memorandum of the facts which I knew, and I had a conversation with Mr. Dieudonné Peloquin, and I suggested to him, and we spoke about what means we should take to obtain justice from the department.

Q. What other justice did you expect from the government than that of having done some work and of having been paid?

Q. Are you aware that Mr. Lanctot has paid four hundred and fifty-seven dollars for that work?—A. No, sir.

Mr. McDougall objects to question, on grounds of illegality.

Question allowed by the President.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is intended to show the animus of the witness.

Mr. Laflamme.—More than that, to discredit him.

The CHAIRMAN.—To show the animus of the witness in the declaration he made and in the action he has taken in these proceedings.

Q. What justice did you expect from the department?—A. We were reckoning that the men were not quite well treated.

Q. They were well paid, but treated rudely?—A. Yes, they were well paid but treated rudely.

Q. They were treated rudely by Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé?—A. That is to say, there were many who had grievances against the department.

Q. Against whom?—A. Against certain foremen.

Q. Who were those employees against whom you had grievances?—A. I had some myself, personally, with Mr. Pagé.

Q. He was your foreman?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you begin taking the notes which you mention, and which contained your grievances? You must have started early?—A. About November 18. From November 18 to November 20.

Q. 1909?—A. 1910.

Q. You began taking those notes, after you had been dismissed from the service?—A. About ten days after that, yes.

Q. Why have you not taken those notes before that, instead of waiting afterwards?—A. I have taken some notes before. At the time that I was working, I also took a few notes. But to make that declaration, I took them after

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. When did you begin to take notes as against Mr. Pagé previous to the time you were discharged?—A. I took some notes in 1909.

Q. Did you take some in 1910?—A. During the summer of 1910.

Q. I meant that you kept an eye on Mr. Pagé to know what he was doing and what did he not do?—A. He ordered me to do things which, I knew, were not right. He used to send me to work outside and I registered as usual.

By Mr. Victor Geoffrion, M.P.:

Q. You talk about grievances. If you had been reinstated, do you not think those grievances would have been diminished?—A. —

Q. You speak about the greivances you had against some employees of the government; do you think that if the government had consented to take you back, this fact would not have lessened your grievances?—A. It would have been the same thing for me,—as to myself.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. If you have noticed that what he asked you to do was not right, why did you not denounce him at once, instead of waiting till you were discharged?—A. It is because I was afraid—that is, denounced, it was known; nearly all the citizens knew it.

Q. Why did you not prepare a solemn declaration the same as the one you have prepared on the 30th of November, since it was correct.—A. It is because I did not have the opportunity.

Q. You have given us the only reason which induced you to sign the declaration of the 30th of November, viz.: that it was not correct; it was the only reason you had to do that?—A. The reason is that some of the contractors in the town had spoken to me and had also found that it was not fair and that I did not like myself to go to work outside and interfere with those people; it was against my will when Mr. Pagé was sending me to work outside.

Q. Did you have, on the 4th of December, 1910, Sunday, a conversation with the painter Louis Paul?—A. I had a conversation with Mr. Louis Paul, but I do not remember the date.

Q. At all events it was at a later date than the one of your declaration of the 30th of November?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Some days later?—A. Yes, some days later.

Q. What did you say to him?—A. I asked him how long he had worked at Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. Did you ask him something else?—A. I asked him to write for me on a sheet of paper the time he had worked there and to sign it.

Q. Did you ask him something else?—A. I do not remember. I do not remember having asked him anything else.

Q. Did you say something else to him?—A. I do not remember having said something else to him. I might have said something else; I stayed there some time, but I do not remember what it was.

Q. Did you talk about the foreman, Pagé?—A. His name must have been mentioned, but I have no recollection.

Q. You swear that you have no recollection of it? Look at me; look up?—A. I have no recollection of it.

Q. Did you not say to him: 'Something is going to take place next week'?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you not say to him that some change was going to take place?—A. I did not say to him that some change was going to take place. I told him that I would try to make a change. It puts me in mind, from the writing—

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Which change?—A. I do not remember. I do not remember in what way. I have not made note of it. I swear that I have no recollection of it.

Q. You swear you said on that occasion that a change was going to take place, but you swear that you do not remember now what kind of a change it was?—A. I do not swear that I said a change was going to take place; I might have spoken of a change, but I do not remember in which way.

Q. When you spoke to him of that change, on the 4th of December, you knew what you were talking about?—A. If I spoke of a change I must have known what I was talking about.

Q. You spoke to him about that; you swear it?—A. I do not swear that I said a change was going to take place; I swear that a conversation on that subject must have occurred, on the subject of a change, but I do not swear that I said one was going to take place.

Q. A change was mentioned; which change?—A. My object was, I wanted that the workingmen would receive better treatment and that justice be given to the workingmen from outside for the outside work; if a change was mentioned it was with that object in view.

Q. Is it not a fact that you said to him: 'The damned, he will go out, sure'?—A. I cannot have said that to him, because I did not know what I could do. I cannot have said that. At all events, I do not remember having said that to him.

Q. You know who is the 'dammed' when I refer to that man? Pagé was the man?—A. I never used such a word on that occasion. I do not remember having used such a word on that occasion.

Q. Was a mention made of it on that occasion?—A. A mention must have been made of it, but I have no recollection.

Q. About what?—A. I have no recollection of it.

Q. Is Louis Paul one of your friends?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is an honest man?—A. I know him to be an honest man.

Q. Do you know Henri Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is also one of your friends?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is also an honest man?—A. I know him to be an honest man.

Q. On the 4th of December, Sunday, did you have an interview with Henri Paul about what was going on in the shop?—A. I do not remember the date; I had an interview with him but I do not remember the date.

Q. Was it not on a Sunday?—A. I think it was on a Sunday or a holiday. It was on a holiday; I do not know it was on a Sunday.

Q. A couple of days after you had signed the declaration of the 30th of November?—A. Some days later.

Q. The same day that you had seen Louis Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you say to him?—A. I asked him if he had some notes to give me about certain special facts he knew of, I supposed he knew of.

Q. What was his answer?—A. He told me that, at the time, he could not do it.

Q. Did you say something else to him?—A. Yes, I said something else to him, I do not remember exactly word by word, I did not make note of it.

Q. Approximately?—A. I told him that, if he could give me some information, I would try to have justice given to the working men and the painters with the information he would give me and that I would not forget him when the occasion comes.

Q. That is all you said?—A. I told him also that I thought, with the information he could give me, I could find fault with Mr. Pagé.

Q. And with the result?—A. And that, with those notes, I would endeavour to have justice given.

Q. Did you use these words: 'That I would try to have justice given?—A. I must have used those words, something like that; but I did not make note of it.

The Committee rose at 1 p.m.

APPENDIX No. 3

3.30 o'clock p.m.

The examination of HENRI PROULX, resumed.

By Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Proulx, did you say on that occasion, to Henri Paul that you desired to have Mr. Pagé put out?—A. I told him that with the notes which he could give me, if his notes were correct, that probably Mr. Pagé might go out; but I could not be sure.

Q. And then you said that if Mr. Pagé lost his position, you would take his place?—A. No, sir; I never said that.

Q. Did you say anything which sounds like that a little?—A. I told him that the one who would replace him, I did not doubt, would be able to protect him more.

Q. Henri Paul?—A. Yes.

Q. You had an idea of the one who might replace him?—A. Not directly; no, I had no idea.

Q. Indirectly had you?—A. I had no idea. I did not know who could replace him. That is, I very well knew who was able to take his place; but the only thing was that for a place as this one there are many strings to be pulled.

Q. And you did not know if you could have enough strings to get the job?

The WITNESS.—To get the position for myself?

The COUNSEL.—Yes?

A. I did not speak to him for myself; I did not tell him that I was to get the position; I did not speak to him for my own self.

Q. You did not tell him what you thought?—A. What I was thinking, that belonged to me, to me alone.

Q. At that time you were thinking of something which you did not tell him?—A. I do not remember that I told him.

Q. You thought you would have as much chance as another man?—A. I do not know; sometimes—

Q. Did you, at that time, tell Henri Paul that if he declared nothing he would have no work?—A. Hey! I did not tell him that, no.

Q. Did you ask him to help you?—A. I do not remember that I did.

Q. Did he tell you: 'It is useless for me to try and help you'?—A. I do not remember either.

Q. What were your last words in that conversation?—A. I asked him not to say a word about the interview I had had with him.

Q. Why did you wish to conceal the fact that you had been there; it was not a mortal sin?—A. At the time, it was for the purpose that it should not be known. At the time, it was at the beginning—I did not wish that it should become a matter of notoriety; because, in order to succeed in a matter—

Q. What were your motives to prevent the matter from becoming public?—A.

Q. Were you ashamed?—A. I cannot say the exact motives. I was fearing that he might have compromised me. I do not know exactly the purpose I had at the time, nor the words which were used.

Q. Were you ashamed that the matter should be known in the public?—A. No, I was not ashamed.

Q. But you were fearing that you might be compromised?—A. Not directly; only it was in view of not being considered....In the first place, I did not want Mr.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Jean Baptiste Pagé to have knowledge of it, because that was in the first days that I was asking notes; I did not want the thing to be known in the first days.

Q. At that moment, he had discharged you?

The WITNESS.—Mr. Pagé?

The COUNSEL.—Yes. Well, yes, it was on December 4.

A. I do not know if it was on December 4, but I had been discharged.

Q. If what you were doing was honest, why were you afraid of being compromised?

—A. I thought I was acting honestly. If I was unwilling to have the thing known, it was not because I thought it was not honest.

Q. If it was honest, what had you to fear through the fact becoming public?—

A. I was afraid not to succeed in what I wanted. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the law to know if that was dishonest, or. . . I do not know the law enough for that.

Q. Now, did you mention, on that occasion, to Henri Paul, the name of M. Cardin, attorney? Take your time before answering.—A. I don't think so.

Q. Is it not true that you have asked to Henri Paul to go with you to M. Cardin?

—A. No, sir.

Q. You swear to that, positively?—A. I do, positively.

Q. Under the oath you have given?—A. Under the oath I have given.

Q. And you maintain that you have not even mentioned Mr. Cardin's name?—

A. I don't remember.

Q. But you remember having mentioned Mr. Lamoureux's name?—A. I don't remember.

Q. You don't remember?—A. No.

Q. Is it not true that you have asked Henri Paul to go with you to Mr. Omer Lamoureux?—A. I don't remember.

W. Was there any mention of Omer Lamoureux on that occasion?—A. I don't remember.

Q. You don't remember?—A. No.

Q. Did you, on that occasion, mention the name of the same Mr. Lamoureux, to whom you had given your declaration of November 30?—A. I don't remember.

Q. Did you see Mr. Lamoureux on that same day, December 4, on a Sunday?—A. I don't remember. I saw him some time after, but I don't know if it is the same day.

Q. You saw him a couple of days afterwards, and then you told him that you had not been able to succeed in eliciting information from the two Pauls?—A. I did not speak of M. Henri Paul to Mr. Lamoureux.

Q. You mentioned the other?—A. I mentioned the other.

Q. You spoke about Louis Paul?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you say to Mr. Lamoureux about Louis Paul?—A. Mr. Louis Paul had given me a paper on which he had noted his time, and I said to him, to Mr. Lamoureux: 'That is the time of a man who has worked at Mr. Lanctot.'

Q. But, Mr. Proulx, how is it that you did not come to see me with that bit of paper, instead of going to see Omer Lamoureux? What had he to do in that?—A. I did not know you.

Q. Why did you go to see Omer Lamoureux, instead of anybody else in Sorel?—A. It was because he had told me that he was on intimate terms with the Minister, and that with the declarations I had given him he would settle all that in a friendly manner, in the interest of the party, and in our own interest to us, working men.

Q. So that Mr. Lamoureux knew that you had been to see the two Paul; he knew that before you had been to see him?—A. He knew that I had been to see Louis Paul.

Q. It was himself who had sent you there?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are you sure?—Yes, sir.

Q. Who sent you there?—A. I went there on my own accord.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Is it in the presence of Mr. Lamoureux that you signed your declaration of the 30th of November?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At his store?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where did you sign that declaration?—A. At Mr. Albert Thibaudeau's, junior.

Q. Who was there?—A. Mr. Albert Thibaudeau, jr., Mr. Omer Lamoureux.

Q. And who else?—A. And Mr. Alfred Douaire.

Q. Who wrote the declaration—I mean the declaration of the 30th of November?—A. I think it was Mr. Lamoureux—I am not positive, but I think it was him.

Q. Mr. Lamoureux stated to you that he was on intimate terms with the minister; you understood he meant the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he tell you, on that occasion, that he had written to Mr. Lanctot, the member?—A. No, sir.

Q. Now, who wrote the declaration you signed on the first of March?—A. Mr. Viliard, barrister in Sorel.

Q. Who was present?—A. First, Notary Bourgeois was there.

Q. And who else?—A. I think we were only the three of us; I do not remember if anybody else was there.

Q. Who asked you to sign that declaration?—A. Mr. Villiard himself.

Q. Had you seen Mr. Lamoureux some time before?—A. Yes, I had seen Mr. Lamoureux some time previously.

Q. He knew that you were going to sign that declaration?—A. I do not know.

Q. But you told him so later on?—A. I never spoke to him about that, he was informed of it but not by me.

Q. You say there were four painters in Sorel who could have done Mr. Lanctot's work, for instance, Mr. Payette, are you not aware of the fact that Payette was working in Montreal and he was away seven weeks?

WITNESS.—During the time work was going on at Lanctot's?

COUNSEL—Yes.—A. I was not aware of that.

Q. But you were informed of it later on?—A. I was informed of it later on?

Q. Who told you? Payette himself?—Mr. Albert Thibaudeau told me.

Q. Do you know what Lavoie has done last summer? Has he spent the summer without working?—A. I never saw him out of work.

Q. The same answer would apply to Joseph Proulx; you do not know what Joseph Proulx has done?—A. Joseph Proulx did the work for Mr. Norman Massé, about the same time.

Q. Now, as to Mr. Bérubé, has he been out of work last summer?—A. He has been out of work for some time.

Q. How long?—A. I cannot tell how long.

Q. Now, I am going to ask you the last question, sir; when you were getting ready to sign that declaration of the 30th of November, had Lamoureux spoken to you about some application he had sent to the department?—A. No, sir.

Q. Never?—A. No, sir.

Q. Now, from the 5th of November to the 7th of January, is it not a fact that you have met Mr. Lanctot on many occasions in order to ask him to do his best to have you reinstated?—A. I met him often during the fortnight after I was discharged.

Q. Did you ask him to be taken back in the shop?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Many times?—A. Three or four times.

Q. And what did he answer you?—A. He answered me each time that he would see to it.

Q. Then you found it was taking time to get an answer?—A. I did not think of the time. I imagined that it was impossible. I had no confidence.

Q. Mr. Napoleon Proulx is your uncle?—A. Yes, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. What is the name of the other Mr. Proulx who was present on the 6th of January?—A. Joseph Proulx.

Q. And Joseph Proulx is also your uncle?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They both are honest men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your uncle is the one who asked you through Mr. Cosky?—A. Madame Cosky told me that my uncle was asking me to go to the office of Mr. Lanctot, that he wished to see me without fail.

Q. When Mr. Lanctot asked you or suggested that you should write a letter to suit you, why did you not do it?—A. Because I did not wish to contradict the writing which I had signed.

Q. If he was asking you to write what you were desirous of writing, there was no danger that you should contradict your own words. Why did you not consent?—A. I understood it might be to the same effect as the letter that he had written out for me.

Q. Now, in a word, Mr. Proulx, you had not much to complain against Mr. Lanctot, but you had something against the people at the shop?—A. I had not much to complain of against Mr. Lanctot personally, but I always thought that Mr. Lanctot could remedy the evil—or could come to an understanding to settle certain grievances which the operatives had.

Q. What grievances?

Mr. McDougall, K.C., objects to this question as being irrelevant to the purposes of the inquiry.

Mr. Laflamme withdraws his question.

Q. The men who remained after November 5 had no grievances, had they?—A. I do not know.

Q. Then, when you speak of grievances, you intend to mention grievances of those who had been dismissed?—A. The operatives who have not been dismissed. I do not know if they were in earnest, but they often spoke to me of certain grievances they had against the Department, whilst I was at work with them.

Q. Were those the grievances which you were desirous of settling?—A. I was supposed to settle grievances in general; unjust acts in general.

Q. You told us this morning that they were well paid, such of them as were employed; what grievances could they then have?—A. They were well paid of their salary, but their salary was not high enough, according to them, for the work they were doing.

Q. You then say that the statements of November 30, you signed it in order to try and obtain redress for that grievance that they were not paid high enough?—A. They had not only that grievance.

Q. But, sir, there is no question of it in your statement of November 30?—A. It is because I expected that we would have an interview with the member on the subject. In the first place, Mr. Lamoureux and I were convinced that the Minister would have considered it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN asks Mr. Laflamme what the grievances of the operators may have to do with the subject matter of this inquiry where the only question is as to charges made against Mr. Lanctot.

Mr. LAFLAMME answers that the same have nothing to do, except in proving the answers of the witness.

The CHAIRMAN answers that this seems to him to be amply proved.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Outside of Mr. Douaire, who may have worked a longer time than the time mentioned in the list, will you mention the others who may have worked during a longer period of time or a greater number of days than the days mentioned in this statement?—A. I did not keep the time of these people.

Q. Then, you do not know it?—A. I cannot swear to it.

APPENDIX No. 3

Re-examined by Mr. McDougall, K.C.

Q. Mr. Proulx, I understood that in the course of the cross questions which were put to you, you said that, in the interview which you had with Mr. Louis Paul, he told you that he had worked one month at Mr. Lanctot's house, and that he gave you a memo to that effect?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you that memo?—A. I gave it to Mr. Lamoureux.

Q. Is that memo. in the handwriting of Mr. Louis Paul?—A. It is, sir.

Q. Will you take communication of the memo. now shown to you, and say if this is the memo. which you say Mr. Louis Paul wrote?

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to the filing of this exhibit, as the exhibit is not signed and is informal.

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. McDougall may ask the witness if Paul gave him the memo., without speaking of the contents of the memo.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Was this memo. now shown to you and filed as Exhibit No. 14 given to you by Mr. Louis Paul?—A. It was.

EXHIBIT No. 14.

Memo.

I declare that I have worked at Mr. Lanctot's house for one month, paid for by the government.

From L. PAUL.'

Q. Will you take communication of the account now shown to you, and state if you know the four men whose names are mentioned there?—A. The four last men who are mentioned there, I did not see them working at Mr. Lanctot's house to my knowledge.

Q. Do you say that you did not see them work, or that you do not know if they have worked?—A. I did not see them work.

Q. Do you know these men personally?—A. I do.

Q. Will you swear that these four men did not work at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. They did not work in my presence; I have no knowledge that they worked there.

Q. You have spoken of profits to be made on a job of \$850 or \$900; you also said that the material had been calculated at the price at the time?—A. At the price at the time.

Q. Then I presume you did not expect to make profits out of material which you were putting into a job at cost price?—A. No, sir.

Q. So that when you speak of a profit of 20 or 25 per cent, you speak of a profit which you could have made upon a sum of \$550 and not upon a total sum of \$850 or \$900?—A. A profit on the price of the men's time, together with my salary.

Q. And that time, you put it at \$550?—A. Yes.

Q. Were the other contracting painters also complaining of the unjust competition which the Marine Department was putting them up against.

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to this question as being irrelevant of the object of this inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN maintains the objection.

Q. During the month of June did you see the man named Octavien Lafrenière mentioned here work at the house of Mr. Lanctot?—A. No, sir.

Q. You spoke, Mr. Proulx, of the paper which had been put upon the walls of a certain room in Mr. Lanctot's house; do you know who did that work?—A. I saw Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé do a part of it. I cannot swear who it was who did it.

Witness discharged.

ALFRED DOUAIRE, sworn.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Where do you reside, Mr. Douaire?—A. At Sorel.

Q. What is your age and occupation?—A. I am a painter and am aged fifty-one years.

Q. How many years have you had of an experience as a painter?—A. Forty-two years as a painter.

G. Have you been before employed by the Dominion government at their ship yards at St. Joseph de Sorel?—A. I have.

Q. And if so, during what periods?—A. I have been working there for five years.

Q. During what time?—A. I cannot say the date, I know I have worked nearing on five years.

Q. In what year did you begin to work for the department?—A. I cannot say what year.

Q. Was it in 1906 or 1907?—A. I cannot say that at all.

Q. You have been working for five years, when did you stop working for the government?—A. I left off in the fall, it was last fall.

Q. Do you remember in what month last year you ceased to work for the government?—A. It is a little before the ice froze in, I cannot say the date. The ice was not frozen yet.

Q. What work were you doing for the government?—A. Painting.

Q. Had you a foreman?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is his name?—A. Baptiste Pagé.

Q. Do you mean Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. Jean Baptiste Pagé, yes.

Q. What was this Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. He was the painters' boss.

Q. Well in the course of 1909 and 1910 did you do certain work for the house of Mr. Lanctot, member of parliament, and if so under whose orders?

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to this question as the statement signed by this witness reads as follows:—In the course of the last two years especially in the course of last year, in July, August and September, 1910.

Question allowed by the Chairman.

A. Under the orders of Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé the foreman of the painters of the government.

Q. In the course of the months of July, August and September, 1910, last summer, did you work at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I did.

Q. Under whose orders?—Who had sent you there to work?—A. Jean Baptiste Pagé, the boss painter.

Q. Did you work at Mr. Lanctot's house in the month of July?—A. I did.

Q. In the month of August, 1910, did you also work at the house of Mr. Adéland Lanctot?—A. I did.

Q. During the months of July and August, 1910, were you sent to work at Mr. Lanctot's house, by the same Jean Baptiste Page?—A. I was.

Q. When he so sent you to do this work at Mr. Lanctot's house, at what part of the government's works were you employed?—A.

Q. What were you doing at St. Joseph de Sorel for the government when he sent you to work?—A. I was working at the paint work.

Q. Where?—A. I was working in the government's yards; I was working for the government.

Q. At St. Joseph de Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The first time you went to work, in July, did you punch to register your time?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Who was looking after the punching?—A. Mr. Champagne.

Q. What was his first name?—A. Cuthbert Champagne.

Q. Cuthbert Champagne was looking after the punching when you left for the first time, in July?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In August, was the same man looking after the punching?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you punch during those two months before you went to work?—A. No, sir; I punched the first time when I left.

Q. You punched only once during the month of July, for the period extending between the month of July and the month of August?—A. When I left to go to work at Mr. Lanctot's house, I punched the first time, then during the time I worked there, I supposed somebody else punched for me, because on pay days I got my salary in full; my time was in full, I was paid for.

Q. Do I understand that somebody else punched for you?—A. There must have been somebody else; I do not know for my part. What makes me say—on pay days I was paid as if I had worked for the government.

Q. Does the government pay some men except those who punch?—A.—

Q. If you had not punched, would you be paid?—A. No.

Q. During the months of July and August, when you were working at Mr. Lanctot's house, has Mr. Lanctot paid for your wages?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has the government paid for those wages?—A. The government has paid for those wages.

Q. You worked also at Mr. Lanctot's house during the months of September and October?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In September and October did you punch your time?—A. No, sir.

Q. Who paid your wages for the time you worked at Mr. Lanctot's building during the months of September and October?—A. The government.

Q. What was your salary?—A. Two dollars.

Q. Two dollars per day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. During all that period, during the months of July, August, September and October?—A. During all the time I worked there.

Q. To the best of your knowledge, how many days have you worked at Mr. Lanctot's house during the months of July, August, September and October?—A. Eight weeks.

Q. Have you been paid for those eight weeks at the rate of two dollars a day, by the government?—A. I have been paid all the time at the rate of two dollars a day.

Q. By the government?—A. By the government.

Q. When you were working at Mr. Lanctot's house, were there any other employees of the Department of Marine and Fisheries working at the same time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you name some of them?—A. I remember some of them.

Q. Do you say that you can name some of them?—A. Yes.

Q. Please name them?—A. Edmond Brault, Theodore Emond, Arthur Trempe.

Q. Did Adelard Letendre work there?—A. Adelard Letendre also.

Q. Albéric Letendre?—A. Albéric Letendre also.

Q. Omer Pagé?—A. Omer Pagé also.

Q. Louis Paul?—A. Louis Paul also.

Q. Did Adélard Aly work there also?—A. Adélard Aly, yes.

Q. Who paid those men for the work?—A. The government.

Q. When that work was being done at Mr. Lanctot's, did you ever see Mr. Lanctot himself and Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé where you were working?—A. I saw Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé between twelve and one o'clock, at noon.

Q. Did you see him often?—A. Not very often, sometimes.

Q. Did you see Mr. Adélard Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was he coming to visit or inspect the work you were doing?—A. I cannot say if he was coming to inspect; he used to go in the house every time. He used to go upstairs, go downstairs and go away.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Did he see you, with the other men, at work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you, to do the work referred to, you and the other men, receive some paint and material taken in the shops of the government for the work referred to?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who brought those paints and those things?—A. Omer Pagé.

Q. Is he the only one you saw bringing those things?—A. It was he who used to bring me in the morning, the colour, the paint I used at Lanctot's; it belonged to the government.

Q. When you speak of a special colour, what do you mean?—A. It is the paint I put on the inside.

Q. It was a green colour, was it not?—A. Yes, green.

Q. Mr. Pagé brought it to you?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he come often to bring you that paint?—A. Yes, often; when I needed some he would bring it to me.

Q. Who was given orders to bring that paint there?—A. I do not know whom he was receiving his orders from, but it belonged to the government.

Q. Did you receive also some putty?—A. Some putty, yes.

Q. Who brought the putty?—A. They were bringing it themselves, because it was from——. They brought it for the time we needed it when we were working inside. I was working inside the house, not outside.

Q. Did you see a man named Henri Proulx come with Omer Pagé and bring some paint or something else?—A. I saw Henri Proulx, but I did not see him bring any paint; when he came I was working on the top of the building.

Q. When he came?—A. Yes.

Q. When did he come?—A. I think, if I am not mistaken, he came with Henri Paul.

Q. Was Mr. Lanctot aware that the paint was taken from the shops of the government?—A. No doubt.

Q. Why do you say no doubt?—A. I do not know if he was aware of it.

Q. Then why do you say no doubt?—A. Because he never told me if it was taken from the shops or from some other place.

Q. Was he there when the painters arrived?

The WITNESS.—Mr. Lanctot?

The COUNSEL.—Yes?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. When you started to work at Mr. Lanctot's house, was the painting well advanced?—A. Yes, well advanced.

Q. Did you work until the painting was finished?—A. When I did quit the painting was not finished.

Q. You saw the house after your departure?

The WITNESS.—After I had left?

The COUNSEL.—Yes?

The WITNESS.—If I saw some men doing some painting?

The COUNSEL.—If you saw the house yourself?—A. No, sir. That is, I went back there, but not to do any painting.

Q. I did not ask you that?—A. When I started to work, I worked and I did not go back after I was through working.

Q. Can you make an estimate, based on your experience as a painter, of the value of the work made by the men and of the painting used to paint Mr. Lanctot's house?

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to that question.

Question allowed by the Chairman.

Q. Will you give us an idea, under oath, of the value of the work done or the paint and wages of the men?—A. Listen, do you want me to make an estimate as if

APPENDIX No. 3

for instance, I was going to take the contract?

Q. All right, make your estimate.—A. Taking everything on the same footing, pay all expenses, house glazing, everything.

Q. We will try that first as if you had the contract?—A. For my part I value that, everything at my own expenses, one thousand dollars.

Q. What does that include?—A. The glazing, everything, a house when completed, outside and inside, pay the men, everything.

Q. Tell us on what you base your estimate?—A. I base my estimate on the fact that there was much time lost. The time lost, the time we spent in going to get paid, we used to lose at least one hour to go and get paid.

Q. It is included in your estimate?—A. Yes.

Q. Now tell us how you figure out for the wages of the men, the supply of paint and the glazing; divide your estimate. You would have taken the contract for one thousand dollars? How much do you estimate the work of the men?—A. I would estimate it, at the least, one dollar and a half, one dollar and three quarters.

Q. Taken all together. In round figures?

WITNESS.—In round figures for the men?

COUNSEL.—Yes.—A. I would estimate it to four hundred dollars.

Q. And then, what would be the amount of paint and putty, and oil and dye?—A. How much paint in weight?

Q. You estimate at four hundred dollars the wages of the men?—A. Yes.

Q. You would have taken the contract for one thousand dollars?—A. Yes.

Q. Out of that amount you take four hundred dollars for the work of the men, what is your estimate for the material, paint, oil, turpentine, brushes, everything needed?—A. I would estimate it to three hundred dollars.

Q. Three hundred dollars for the paint. How much for the glazing and for—A.—

Q. You have four hundred dollars for the wages of the men, three hundred dollars for the paint, that gives a total of seven hundred dollars?—A. I would estimate the glazing at about ninety-five dollars; only for the putty not for the panes.

Q. You said that for thousand dollars you would do all the glazing?—A. I would do it all for one thousand dollars.

Q. The ninety-five dollars are only for setting in the panes?—A. Yes, yes, for the setting of the panes, not including the cost of the panes, it is for the putty appliance.

Q. About the 7th of December, 1910, has somebody asked you to go to Mr. Lanctot's, that Mr. Lanctot wanted to see you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you go?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell us what happened?—A. Yes.

Q. Proceed?—A. Mr. Lanctot sent a man for me; he sent Mr. Arthur Lavallée, lumberman. Mr. Lavallée came to see me at my place. He told me: 'Mr. Lanctot wants to see you without fail.'

Q. What hour of the day was it?—A. It must have been about half past eight or nine o'clock p.m.

Q. Did you go?—A. Yes, I went. Mr. Lanctot said to me: 'I am going to read this paper to you.' He read it to me.

Q. What paper do you mean?—A. It is a declaration, one of the declarations I have made myself.

Q. A solemn declaration?—A. No, it is another one, made previously.

Q. Have you got that declaration with you?—A. No.

Q. When did you make that declaration?—A. That declaration was made about one month, one month and a half, before that, before I went to Mr. Lanctot.

Q. You have not it with you? You cannot produce it?—A. No, sir.

Q. To who did you give that declaration?—A. That declaration, I gave it to Mr. Thibaudeau.

Q. Albert Thibaudeau?—A. Albert Thibaudeau, junior.

Q. Had Mr. Lanctot your statement in his possession, say?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he show it to you?—A. He read it to me.

Q. Where did he get that document?—A. I cannot say where he got it.

Q. He had it?—A. He had it.

Q. Did he read it to you?—A. He read it to me.

Q. What happened?—A. He read the declaration to me; he asked me if it was the right one; then he asked me if it was my signature. I answered yes.

Q. He read to you the contents of the declaration you had made previously, Mr. Lanctot?—A. He read to me my declaration, yes.

Q. What did he ask you about that declaration?—A. He asked me if I was ready to take my old position I had with the government. I then said: 'As long as Mr. Pagé, master painter, is on the other side with the government I will not go back.'

Q. Do you mean Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. Jean Baptiste Pagé, yes.

Q. Did he say something about Albert Thibaudeau?—A. No; he did not say anything about Albert Thibaudeau.

Q. Did he say something to you about certain papers Albert Thibaudeau had in his possession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was said about that?—A. Mr. Lanctot asked me if I wanted to have the papers. I told him it was pretty hard to have them. He said: 'If you cannot get hold of them, I will do it myself.' He told me that if I could not get them myself, that he would get them. He told me: 'If you cannot have the papers'—to take them to Mr. Lanctot—Mr. Lanctot told me: 'Try to get those papers,' and he told me: 'If you cannot get them, I will have them myself.'

Q. Which papers did he want you to have for him?—A. I suppose—Thibaudeau had some papers.

Q. Which papers did Mr. Lanctot ask you to get for him from Albert Thibaudeau?—A. Yes, yes; meaning Albert Thibaudeau: 'Try to get the papers.'

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to that answer.

Q. Which papers did Mr. Lanctot——?—A. I do not know which papers he wanted to have. He told me: 'Try to get the papers. If you cannot have them, I will get them myself.'

Q. It was not *Le Soleil*, *La Vigie* or *Le Devoir* he wanted. He must have explained it to you?—A. Mr. Lanctot knew he had some other papers. He wanted to have them. I said it was pretty hard to get them. He then said: 'If you cannot have them, I will get them myself.'

Q. Which papers were you referring to when you said to Mr. Lanctot: 'It is pretty hard for me to get them'?—A. I referred to the papers Mr. Thibaudeau had.

Q. What kind of papers?—A. I cannot say what kind. He wanted to have the papers. He said: 'If you cannot have them, I will get them myself.'

By Mr. Lancaster:

Q. Which papers was Mr. Lanctot referring to when he told you to go and get the papers at Mr. Thibaudeau's?—A. Mr. Lanctot did not say which papers they were; he told me: 'Try to get the papers Thibaudeau has at his house.'

Q. Were they documents or a piece of wall paper, or some wrapping paper, what?—A. He referred to some declarations he wanted to get hold of.

Q. Now, sir, in 1908, during the month of October, did you do some work for Mr. Adélard Lanctot at a house situated on King street, which he occupied as tenant of Mr. Bruneau Leclerc?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were employed during that time at the department as a painter?—A. As a painter, yes.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Who sent you to do some work at the house occupied by Mr. Adélard Lanctot?
—A. Jean Baptiste Pagé.

Q. Did you punch before you left?—A. I punched before I left.

Q. Did you go to Mr. Lanctot's on King street?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you do there?—A. I did some papering; papering and painting.

Q. How many days did you work there?—A. I worked about three days.

Q. How much did you receive as wages during that time?—A. Two dollars a day.

Q. Who paid you for the three days' work you made at Mr. Lanctot's house on King street in 1908?—A. I made a mistake; it was not two dollars a day I was getting at the time.

Q. What were you earning?—A. When I was working there I think I was earning one dollar and ninety cents.

Q. Who paid you for that work?—A. The government paid me for the three days I worked there.

Q. Has Mr. Lanctot, directly or indirectly, ever paid you for that work or part of the work?—A. Never.

Q. When you were working on the premises rented by Mr. Lanctot, has he seen you at work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who supplied the paint and the material?—A. It was there when I arrived.

Q. Do you know if those goods belonged to the government?—A. I do not know.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Does the government sell wallpaper?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Was the paint you had at Mr. Lanctot's on King street in 1908 in cans, in jugs, how?—A. No; it was ready-made.

Q. Were there any signs on the cans?—A. I did not notice that.

The Committee then adjourned.

THURSDAY, March 16, 1911.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

The examination of ALFRED DOUAIRE, resumed.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Douaire, I presume that before the paint work is performed in a building the plastering and woodwork should be finished?—A. It was over, in my own work.

Q. I am not asking you for that, I am asking you if in general before the painting is done it is not necessary that the plastering and woodwork should be done?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Naturally, Mr. Douaire, so far as Mr. Lanctot's house is concerned, you do not know when the plastering was done; that did not concern you?—A. As to me—

Q. Answer my question.—A. Yes, but I wish to say what I saw and what I did, what I had knowledge of. I do not wish to go into all the details, because I have no education and do not know anything about figures.

Q. Do you know when the plastering work was done in Mr. Lanctot's house?

WITNESS.—What do you call the plastering work? The walls.

COUNSEL.—The plaster work, etc.

A. It was done.

Q. I am asking you when it was done?—A. I cannot say.

Q. You do not know?—A. No.

Q. Now, when the plastering is done, how long does it take to do the wood-work?—A. I cannot say.

Q. At all events, you know that you must wait until the plastering is dried up?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long does it generally take to dry up?—A. That is a thing I do not know.

Q. Now, do you know when the woodwork was begun?—A. No.

Q. Do you know when the woodwork was finished?—A. No, sir.

Q. At all events, the painting was not proceeded with before the woodwork was done?—A. That is a thing which I cannot say.

Q. Did you see carpenters working in the building, inside?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you went down the first time to do the painting?—A. I only saw one.

Q. What is his name?—A. Mr. Desrosiers. There was small finishing work which he was doing on one side or another.

Q. How long did you remain there?—A. That, I cannot say.

Q. What is Desrosier's first name?—A. I could not say what his first name is. I have known him a great number of years; I cannot say what his first name is.

Q. You did work there in the month of July; you are mistaken?—A. I began in the month of July.

Q. What are the days of July on which you worked?—A. I cannot give any dates.

Q. You cannot say either how many days?—A. No, sir.

Q. Can you give me the dates you worked during the month of August?—A. No, sir, I cannot give any dates.

Q. Can you say how many days you worked during the month of August?—A. No, sir.

Q. You worked chiefly during the month of September?—A. I started in the month of July and worked during the month of August.

Q. When did you start to work, in the month of July or the month of August?—A. I started to work in the month of July.

Q. How many days did you work during the month of September?—A. I think that I worked eight weeks during the three months I worked there.

Q. No, it is not what I asked you. I am speaking of September; how many days did you work in September?—A. I cannot say.

Q. You did not work eight weeks in September, I suppose?—

WITNESS.—I have not worked eight weeks in September?

COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. No.

Q. Are you sure of it, Mr. Douaire?—A. What.

Q. How many days did you work in September? You do not know?—A. I worked eight weeks during the three months I worked there.

Q. How did you manage to figure out that you had worked eight weeks? Tell us that.

WITNESS.—How I figured it out?

COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. I figured it out approximately.

Q. You say that you have figured it out approximately? Did you make that estimate in writing?—A. No, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. When did you make that estimate, more or less?—A. I figured out the weeks I had worked and I found eight weeks at least; I can swear I worked eight weeks.

Q. That is not what I am asking you; I ask you how you came to eight weeks, more or less?—A. I figured it out according to my conscience.

Q. How did you figure that out, eight weeks?—A. I told you a minute ago, sir.

Q. You did not tell me how you came to put the number of weeks to eight. That is what I want to know?—A. I told you that I figured it out according to my conscience, that I worked there eight weeks during the three months I worked.

Q. We are going to leave your conscience aside for the present and we are going to examine your figures. How did you figure out that you had worked eight weeks instead of five weeks or two weeks?—A. I cannot answer that, not at all.

Q. Now, you would have taken that job for one thousand dollars?—A. Yes, sir, everything at my own expense.

Q. Supplying the men and the material—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you would have made a little profit on the material and on the work?—A. I believe so.

Q. What profit would you have made on the wages of the men?—A. I am not in a position to say it.

Q. You cannot give us an idea of the profit you could have realized on the wages, with a contract of that kind?—A. No, sir.

Q. If I would suggest to you that a profit of 20 to 25 per cent on the wages of the men is a reasonable profit, would you contradict it?

WITNESS.—On each man?

COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. When I take a contract—I am going to tell you exactly how it is—when I take the contract for a building, as I have no instruction and as I have no idea of the figures, I take the contract on a rough estimate. According to my conscience, Mr. Lancot's house would be worth one thousand dollars, everything at my own expense. If you ask me the details I cannot answer.

Q. Now, I put the question again to you: Are you in a position to deny under oath that you could have realized a profit of 20 to 25 per cent on the wages of the men?—A. That is a thing I cannot tell.

Q. At all events, paying \$400 for the men, you would have made a small profit?—A. Out of that you have to pay for the paint.

Q. No, no, I am speaking of the men. You say that you value the wages of the men at \$400. Is it not what you said yesterday?—A. I think I said that yesterday. I asked a moment ago for the evidence I gave yesterday because I would like to be sure of it. I do not take everything in writing, I have only my memory and that is all. About what I said yesterday I could miss something because I never take anything in writing.

Q. Do you remember having said yesterday that, out of a sum of \$1,000 which would represent the value of the work and the material, a sum of \$400 would represent the wages of the men?—A. I do not remember about the \$400 for the wages of the men, but I remember well the \$1,000.

Q. Now, witness, suppose you had said that \$400 would represent the wages of the men, you would have to deduct a little to represent the profits?—A. I do not want to make any mistake with that. If I said \$400, if I said more or less—I do not remember if I have said it, \$400, for the wages of the men.

Q. But, if you have said it was \$400, you would have to deduct something for the profits?—A. I do not remember if I said \$400 or more.

Q. No, but if you said it, you would have to deduct something for the profits?—A. If I said it, yes, naturally.

Q. So that if you would deduct \$25 on the \$400 it would not be too much, would it?—A. ———

Q. A profit of \$25 on \$400?—A. I do not know.

Q. Are you willing to say that it would be too much?—A. That is a thing I cannot say.

Q. So that, sir, you do not know yourself, if \$375 would be too much for the work you would take on contract?—A. It might be.

Q. So that, sir, you do not know, Mr. Douaire, if that account of \$375 would represent the full value of the work, only the wages of the men, for the men who have worked there, for a man would take the job for himself?—A. Whose wages, you say?

COUNSEL.—The wages of the men who have worked at Mr. Lanctôt's; \$375 is a fair remuneration?—A. I do not know.

Q. You said that \$300 would represent the cost of the paint. Do you remember having said that?—A. No.

Q. You do not remember having said that?—A. No.

Q. Do you remember having divided, yesterday at the request of Mr. McDougall, the sum of \$1,000?—A. Yes.

Q. And having mentioned the sum of \$300?—A. I have no recollection of the \$300.

Q. How is your memory, good or bad?—A. Not too good.

Q. Have you an idea of the quantity of paint sent to Mr. Lanctôt's?—A. No.

Q. Have you an idea of the quantity of varnish and oil sent?—A. No.

Q. Have you an idea of the quality of the material and of the quality of the paint sent there?—A. First class paint.

Q. Well, there are several among the good qualities?—A. Among the good qualities?

Q. Then if you don't know the quality, you cannot tell about the value of the paint which was being employed there?—A. I don't know the value of it.

Q. It is the same thing for the varnish and the oil?—A. The same thing.

Q. Do you remember having mentioned yesterday a sum of \$9 representing the value of the putty and the window panes?—A. \$95?

Q. Yes?—A. I have a recollection of \$80. For the window panes, \$80, I remember that.

Q. You don't remember having mentioned a sum of \$95?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know what quantity of putty, coming from the government's shop, has been used at Mr. Lanctôt's?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then, you know nothing about the value of the putty which has been brought there?—A. No, sir.

Q. You don't know, neither, how long it took for putting up the window panes?—A. No, sir, not that I know.

Q. In your estimation of \$1,000, I suppose you also include the window panes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, we come to December 7. When Mr. Lavallée asked you to go to Mr. Lanctôt, did he complain that you had laid an accusation against him?—A. Mr. Lanctôt?

Q. No, Mr. Lavallée.—A. No, sir.

Q. Did he not complain that, in a declaration which you had signed in November, you had laid accusations against him?—A. Mr. Lavallée?

Q. Yes.—A. No.

Q. You are sure?—A. I am sure.

Q. You knew that you had accused Mr. Lavallée?—A. That I have accused Mr. Lavallée?

Q. Yes.—A. I have not accused Mr. Lavallée.

Q. Have you spoken of him in a declaration which you had signed?—A. In a declaration, yes.

Q. You were accusing him to have had three doors glazed by the government's employees?—A. It was I who got the glazing done.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. That was the accusation which you had laid against him?—A. I laid the accusations before Mr. Pagé, not Mr. Lavallée.

Q. Before Mr. Pagé?—A. Yes.

Q. Against Mr. Lavallée?—A. That belonged to Mr. Lavalée. The doors were the property of Mr. Lavallée.

Q. Don't you remember that Mr. Lavallée told you to go to Mr. Lanctot to prove your accusation?—A. Yes, he asked me to go to Mr. Lanctot without fail, saying that he wanted to see me.

A. Yes, because he spoke to me about those three doors: 'There is something for me in that. Come along. He said: If you don't want to come for Mr. Lanctot's sake, come for me.'

Q. And you went there for him?—A. Yes, sir. It was as much for Mr. Lanctot's sake as for Mr. Lavallée—the same thing.

Q. You had not been invited by Mr. Lanctot; it was Mr. Lavallée's invitation?—A. It was Mr. Lanctot who had asked me to go without fail.

Q. You don't know. That is what Mr. Lavallée told you?—A. Mr. Lavallée said to me: 'Come along to Mr. Lanctot. He wants to see you sure. In the meantime, I am somewhat interested myself, because I have something in that.

Q. Did you go to Mr. Lanctot with Mr. Lavallée?—A. I went to Mr. Lanctot with Mr. Lavallée.

Q. What did you say to Mr. Lavallée on the way to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I did not say anything to him.

Q. Did you not tell him that you had nothing against Mr. Lanctot, that he was a good fellow?—A. I said nothing of that. When I left my house to go to Mr. Lanctot, there was nothing said about that, as far as I know. Nor did Mr. Lavallée say anything of the kind to me.

Q. You hesitated before entering Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I hesitated?

Q. Yes?—A. I don't think so.

Q. You did not?—A. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is completely irrelevant to the case.

Q. Have you not admitted to Mr. Lavallée, in that circumstance, that you knew that it was Mr. Lanctot who was to pay the men; that he had paid them, the men?—A. That is a thing I don't know.

Q. Do you know if you have declared that to Mr. Lavalée?—A. That it was Mr. Lanctot who had paid the men?

Q. Yes?—A. No, sir.

Q. On that occasion, did you tell him that he was to pay for them?—A. No, sir.

Q. When you were paid by Mr. Pagé, in October, 1910, how much did you receive?—A. Hold on I do not understand. Are you speaking about the work I did at Mr. Lavallée's?

Q. At Mr. Lanctot's?—A. I am speaking to you about Mr. Lavallée.

Q. I am speaking about Mr. Lanctot?—A. On what street? I worked in two places.

Q. It is strange that you understood at once when Mr. McDougall put that same question to you?—A. I worked in two places.

Q. On King street. How much did you receive for that job from Mr. Pagé?—A. How much money I received for the work I did at Mr. Lanctot's?

Q. On King street?—A. In Mr. Leclaire's old house?

Q. You had worked two days and a half, three days?—A. I have not received a cent.

Q. He did not pay you?—A. I was paid by the government.

Q. Were you paid in cash?—A. The government paid me in cash, of course.

Q. How much did you receive for your week's salary that week?—A. That is something I could not tell. Wages have increased since that time.

Q. Do you know Mr. Omer Lamoureux?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You saw him in connection with the affidavit you prepared in the month of March?—A. Did I have any knowledge?

Q. Have you seen him?—A. When I made that affidavit?

Q. The affidavit you signed in the month of March, the 1st of March, 1911, before Mr. Bourgeois, the notary?—A. That is an affidavit for Mr. Lanctot.

Q. An affidavit they got you to sign?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember that?—A. Yes.

Q. On that day you saw Mr. Lamoureux?—A. Omer Lamoureux, on that day? No, the man who came with me was Mr. Thibaudeau.

Q. Did you never discuss or speak with Mr. Lamoureux about the affidavit you had signed, or were about to sign?—A. The affidavit, he saw it himself and he read it.

Q. Who gave him your affidavit?—A. That I do not know.

Re-examined by Mr. McDougall:

Q. When you worked on King street for Mr. Lanctot at the house which he had rented, did the government pay you the full amount of your wages?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the rate per day that you were then receiving?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much per day were you then receiving?—A. If I remember right, at that time I was receiving \$1.90.

Q. Would you have included in the thousand dollar job, which sum you would have charged for painting at Mr. Lanctot's, labourer's wages, for instance? Would you have hired labourers?—A. No, sir.

Q. You would have employed painters, would you not?

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to this question. The question is allowed by the Chairman.

A. Yes.

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. Mr. Douaire, did you ever personally take any contract for painting?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Several times?—A. Quite a number of times, yes.

Q. Did you personally prepare your own estimates?—A. The estimates I made were in round numbers; not being educated, I made them approximatively.

Q. You cannot make your own estimates yourself?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then who prepared for you the estimate of a thousand dollars for Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. In my opinion, it was worth a thousand dollars.

Q. But you do not know on what you establish, on what you base your estimate?—A. No, sir.

JOSEPH PRATT is called, sworn and examined:

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. What is your name, Mr. Pratte?—A. Joseph Pratte.

Q. You live in the city of Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know the firm of Cyrille Labelle & Co.?—A. Yes, sir. I am the manager.

Q. Does Cyrille Labelle exist or is that the name of the firm?—A. It is the name of the firm.

Q. Have you an interest in it apart from your salary as manager?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you, Mr. Pratte, bring with you the accounts which your firm has had with Mr. Adélard Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN.—There is no doubt about it that it is not proper evidence but I suppose it is a copy of the books and may be accepted as such, it cannot however be admitted if objected to.

APPENDIX No. 3

The document is filed as Exhibit 15.

Q. This account which you produce as Exhibit 15, Mr. Pratte, is it an account for goods furnished to Mr. Adélaré Lancetot between the 2nd of December, 1905, and the 28th of December, 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you bring the books with you?—A. No sir. I had this copied from our books. It is sworn to by our accountant.

Q. Your accountant is L. O. Courchène?—A. No.

Q. 'Sworn to before me, at Sorel, this 15th day of March, 1911, before J. B. Lafrenière, notary,' Is that right?—A. Yes.

Q. Why did you not bring the books?—A. We need our books every day.

Q. And this is a faithful account from your books?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you take a look at the account and state whether it is correct or not?—A. I have no need to examine; it is correct as it is.

Q. You need not specify the items, they speak for themselves. But is there, in 1910, items for paints, &c., furnished and delivered to Mr. Lancetot?—A. I only see fifteen pounds of red ochre. Then there is some shellac.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Was there any varnish?—A. 'Shellac varnish', that is not the same thing. Shellac is not the same thing as varnish. Further on there is another item of shellac. On the 2nd of November, one gallon shellac. November 3rd, one gallon of shellac. November 5th, one gallon varnish. November 5th, one gallon shellac. November 9th, $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon of varnish. The 14th, a pint of varnish. On the 14th, one quart of varnish. On the 15th, one half gallon of white enamel and a quart of turpentine and five pounds of white lead and a quart of varnish. On December 29th, a pint of varnish. That is all there is in paint and varnish.

Q. You have set the prices opposite the articles?—A. Yes.

Q. Has this account for 1908 and 1910 been given to Mr. Lancetot?—A. Yes.

Q. When?—A. I think it was in the month of December.

Q. December, 1910?—A. 1910.

Q. Did he call himself for that account, in 1910, in the month of December?—A. He had asked for it long before that and we produced it in the month of December.

As to the account for 1908, Mr. Magnan had told me that he had instruction from Mr. Lancetot to pay it to me.

Q. Who is Mr. Magnan?—A. Mr. Lancetot's partner. Then I neglected to go and settle with him.

Q. It is settled now?—A. Not yet. We are in contra-account with them.

Q. The account is still open?—A. Still open.

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., Counsel for Mr. Lancetot, states that he has no question to put to the witness in cross-examination.

Witness discharged.

ANDRONIQUE SENEAL, sworn.

Examined by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Where do you live?—A. At Sorel.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Carpenter joiner.

Q. Are you employed at the department of Marine and Fisheries?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you still working for the department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been working for the department?—A. Niue years last fall.

Q. Do you know Mr. Adélaré Lancetot, member for the county of Richelieu?—A. Yes, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. During the year 1910, about the month of May, did you go to Mr. Adelard Lanctot's house on George street, to do some work there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you do some work there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell us what kind of work it was?—A. Yes, sir; it was to repair a fence which was there to prevent children from doing any damage to the garden.

Q. Mr. Lanctot's house was then being built?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were there men working there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember the names of some of those men?—A. Mr. Cardin, contractor was one and a man named Desrosiers who was working for him and who I knew a little.

Q. What is Mr. Desrosier's first name?—A. I do not know.

Q. Before you left to go to work at Mr. Lanctot's, did you punch or register your name by the clock?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who sent you to Mr. Lanctot's to work there?—A. Mr. Bouchard told me that Mr. Champagne asked me to go to Mr. Lanctot's to do some slight repairs.

Q. Which Mr. Champagne do you refer to?—A. Oscar Champagne.

Q. What is Mr. Champagne's occupation?—A. He is timekeeper.

Q. The timekeeper for the department, you mean?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is Mr. Bouchard's name?—A. Adelard Bouchard. He looks after the punch, he takes care of the punch.

Q. What punch does he look after?—A. He looks after the punch of the carpenters joiners, of the electricians, of the caulkers.

Q. Adelard Bouchard, who looks after the punch of the carpenters, told you that Mr. Champagne, the timekeeper wanted you to go and work at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And did you go?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You went from St. Joseph de Sorel to the place mentioned?—A. Certainly.

Q. Did you cross the river?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you cross the river?—A. In a ferry.

Q. Did you have to pay your fare?—A. I would have been obliged to pay if Mr. Champagne had not handed me some tickets.

Q. What tickets?—A. Tickets they give to cross the river at the expense of the government.

Q. Those tickets belong to the department?—A. Certainly.

Q. And they gave you some of those tickets to cross over?

The CHAIRMAN points out that the question of tickets has no importance whatever, and it is not worth losing the time of the committee on that.

Mr. McDougall answers that the object he has in view is to show that in order to go to work at Mr. Lanctot's house the men had to cross the river at the expense of the government, and that this fact seems to be related to the investigation.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—I think it would be better to have an understanding about that question of five cents.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You got some tickets from Mr. Champagne, and you went to Mr. Lanctot's and worked there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many days did you work there?—A. Three days.

Q. Did you meet Mr. Lanctot himself?—A. I met him at his residence the day after I arrived. He showed me the work that was to be done.

Q. He showed you the work?—A. Yes, sir, he told me what to do.

Q. What kind of work did he tell you to do?—A. He told me to repair the fence.

Q. How much were you earning at the department?—A. One dollar and seventy-five cents.

Q. Did you get paid?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. For the three days of work you had done?—A. Yes.

Q. By whom?—A. By the department as usual.

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot ever offer to pay you, or did he give you something for the work?—A. Never.

Q. During the three days you worked at Mr. Lanctot's, did you punch your time when you left the work and when you came back, or was somebody punching for you?—A. I did not punch myself. I only punched the first morning when I left; after that I never looked after my card.

Q. Then somebody, to oblige you, must have punched for you?—A. As for that, I do not know.

Q. Your wages were paid in full, although you did not punch the time yourself?—A. I was paid just like if I had punched my card. I do not know if it was punched. I did not inquire about it. Some one else will tell you.

Q. Mr. Sénécal, you made a solemn declaration, dated the 1st of March, which is now before the committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you look at that solemn declaration handed to you?

(Witness looks at the solemn declaration.)

Q. Your signature is at the bottom?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you notice that in this affidavit you say:

I am employed by the federal government at the shipyards located at St. Joseph de Sorel, now and since nine years.

That on or about the 3rd of May, 1909, Oscar Champagne, employee—

You notice the date: '3rd of May, 1909'; is that date, mentioned in your declaration, correct?—A. It is a mistake. I was sent so often to work outside for men of the same kind that I forgot the year.

Q. Do you say now that the date should be placed in the month of May, 1910, instead of the month of May, 1909?—A. 1910.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.,

Q. Mr. Sénécal, now that your declaration is corrected, will you tell us the date in the month of May, 1909, you worked at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I cannot tell the exact date, because, as I said, it was 'on or about the 3rd of May, 1910.' I think that Mr. Bouchard, when he comes, will be able to tell you the date. He was keeping my time. He will tell you; he is keeping the time.

Q. You were perfectly aware at the time that it was not right, what was going on?—A. Of course; but there are so many things done.

Q. You were at that time as honest as you were in the month of March, 1911?—A. I think so.

Q. Why did you not make any complaint at the time, instead of waiting?—A. Because I was alone at the time. To-day there are others, I joined the others.

Q. And you joined the others at the request of Mr. Thibaudeau or Mr. Lamoureux?—A. No, sir, I joined them on my own accord. I do not need anybody to tell me what I have to do.

Q. Did you see Mr. Lamoureux before you signed that declaration of the 1st of March?—A. I went to see him for that purpose.

Q. How long before the 1st of March was it when you saw Mr. Lamoureux?—WITNESS.—Which Mr. Lamoureux?

COUNSEL.—Lamoureux whose name I just mentioned. You say that you went to see him with that object in view?—A. Not Lamoureux. I understood Thibaudeau. If I said Lamoureux, I beg your pardon. Which Lamoureux? I do not know which Lamoureux you mean.

Q. Do you know Mr. Oscar Lamoureux?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, listen to me well. I ask you if you saw Mr. Lamoureux about that

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. But did you see him after?—A. After, I saw him a couple o ftimes. I do not know him intimately.

Q. Now, for what purpose did you go and see Mr. Lamoureux after you had signed that declaration?—A. Because we met together some of us. . . . Mr. Lamoureux, Mr. Thibaudeau, the other ones you have before you.

Q. And you used to discuss on the declarations?—A. Of course, you spoke of them somewhat.

Q. Now, sir, do you know that there is no garden at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. There is no garden, but there are some fruit trees and previously it was a garden. It was in order to protect his fruit trees.

Q. Out of the three days, the first day you worked there did you see Mr. Lanctot?—A. Not at all.

Q. You saw him only the second day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the afternoon?—A I think it was in the afternoon, about nine o'clock, I suppose.

Q. Had you taken a drink, that same morning?—

WITNESS.—That same morning?

COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. I cannot remember if I had drank that same morning but very little anyway if I had taken any. It is not my habit to take too much.

Q. And Mr. Lanctot told you to get out?—A. No.

Q. He said you were under the influence of liquor?—A. No, he did not say anything to me about that.

Q. Did he not tell you that you were not needed?—A. No, sir, never.

Q. Did you owe some money to Mr. Lanctot at the time?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Do you forget easily what you owe?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you not owe him a sum of thirty-seven dollars and ninety-six cents?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. You have forgotten that altogether?—No, sir; I have not forgotten.

Q. Did you see a man named Dumais?—A. I did.

Q. Who was representing you as attorney?—A. Mr. Lanctot was supposed to represent me, but it was Mr. Mafrau who did the work.

Q. You won your case?—A. I did.

Q. But they were unable to collect from Dumais?—A. That I do not know.

Q. At any rate, the costs of Lanctot and Mafrau aggregated \$37.96?—A. I never heard anything about it.

Q. At anyrate, you know you have not paid one cent of these costs?

Mr. McDougall objects to this evidence, as the debt due to Lanctot and Mafrau is not the debt due to Lanctot.

Mr. Laflamme withdraws the question.

Q. Have you a son in Sorel?—A. I have.

Q. How old is he?—A. I have one who is eighteen years old, and I have two others who are a little younger.

Q. Did you ask Mr. Lanctot to have your son appointed?—A. I did.

Q. When?—A. It was after the first election of Mr. Lanctot; I cannot tell the date. I am not very much educated.

Q. He did not succeed in getting him appointed?—A. No, sir.

Q. He could have, if he had desired it?—A. I think so.

Q. And then, knowing that, you were dissatisfied?—A. I was not in a very good humour, no.

Q. And then you expressed your dissatisfaction to Adélarde Bouchard?

The Witness.—At what time?

APPENDIX No. 3

The COUNSEL.—No matter what time.

Mr. McDougall.—You must limit your question to the time which is in question in this inquiry.

Mr. Laflamme.—You are right.

Q. Did you not tell Bouchard that Lanctot would regret it?—A. I do not impossible to get your son appointed before you signed your statement?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. What did you tell him?

The WITNESS.—To Bouchard?

The COUNSEL.—Yes?

—A. I told him so many things, I spoke to him so many times, that I may have forgotten; but tell me the facts and I will tell you if it is true or if it is not.

Q. Did you not tell Bouchard that Lanctot would regret it?—A. I do not remember that, sir. I did not say it.

Q. Do you swear that you did not say it?—A. I do.

Q. What did you say?—A. You know, sometimes we have a conversation between us. Bouchard is a man who works with me, and we spoke between us, as we often do. But I am not a shorthand writer, so that I do not write everything I say. Tell me what you pretend that I have said, and I will tell you if I said so. You are there to question me and I am here to answer.

Q. Witness, do you remember what you told Bouchard, or do you not?—A. Not everything; but if you tell me I will know if I said so or if I did not.

Q. Tell us what you remember?—A.

Q. When you don't remember everything, you remember something. That is the something that I am interested in. Tell it to me?—A. Bouchard will come and he will tell you what I said to him.

Q. Never mind Bouchard. He might not come at all?—A. I do not recollect upon what subject, upon what point.

Q. About the position your son could not get?—A. If you wish me to tell you why he did not get the position I shall tell you.

Q. No, that is not it. What is it you said to Bouchard? Now, let us start in a hurry?—A. If you wish me to tell you what I told Bouchard, I will tell you; but I will tell you as it is. If you wish me to tell you, I will tell you all the conversation we had on this subject.

Q. Did you not tell Adélaïde Bouchard that if Lanctot did not get your son appointed, he would regret it?

Mr. McDougall objects to the question unless time, place and circumstances are mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN allows the question.

Q. Did you not tell him, during the last week, that if your son did not get his job, there would be a row?—A. Mr. Baril offered me a job for my son, and I refused it. I said: 'I am going to stay in Montreal; I do not want any more job.' Not only for one, for three.

Q. Did you not tell Bouchard, during the last week, that if you had signed the statement of March 1st, 1911, the reason was that your son had not been appointed?—A. I do not remember that, because I signed statements a long time before that; in the month of January, I think, if I am not mistaken, or February.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. When you speak of Mr. Baril in your cross-questions, which Baril do you mean?—A. Mr. Alfred Baril, who is in the Marine Department.

Q. The accountant?—A. The accountant in Sorel.

Witness discharged.

NAPOLÉON LAROCHE, sworn.

Examined by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. You live in the city of Sorel, Mr. Laroche?—A. At St. Joseph de Sorel.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a painter.

Q. Are you in the employ of the Marine and Fisheries Department?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have been?—A. I have been.

Q. When did you cease being there?—A. I left last fall.

Q. How long did you work for the Department?—A. I worked for four years.

Q. Do you know Mr. Adélard Lanctot, the member for the county of Richelieu?
—A. I do.

Q. During the year 1910, did you do any work at Mr. Lanctot's house, then in course of erection, or did you see other men in the employ of the department working there?—A. I did not do any work there myself, but I saw men who went to work there, to my knowledge.

Q. Who are those men?—A. There is one Mr. Douaire.

Q. Alfred Douaire?—A. Yes, sir. There is one Mr. Brault.

Q. What is his first name?—A. Edmond Brault, Adélard Ally, Alberic Letendre, Adélard Letendre, Théodore Emond, Louis Paul, Arthur Trempe, Omer Pagé.

Q. Were these men painters?—A. They were.

Q. During what months of the year did they work at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. To my knowledge, they began in the commencement of the summer and they worked until the cold weather in the fall.

Q. Were they men who were with you at St. Joseph de Sorel?—A. They were.

Q. Did you see them leave to go and work?—A. The Sorel ones, I did not see them go, I saw them when they came to get paid.

Q. While they were at Lanctot's house, you did not see them on the work at St. Joseph de Sorel?—A. Not at all; except Omer Pagé. As to Omer Pagé he lived at St. Joseph de Sorel, and, in the morning, before he went, he would get his card 'punched' and then he would go to Sorel—at noon, he would come back to dinner at St. Joseph, and he would get a 'punch' again, and in the evening when he came back, he would get 'punched' again.

Q. The other men that you have mentioned did not live at St. Joseph, did they?
—A. No, in Sorel.

Q. Usually, the men who do not live in St. Joseph de Sorel came from Sorel in the morning, they get their card 'punched' and then they work; and, in the evening, they go back to their home—A. These did not come to get 'punched', their cards were 'punched'.

Q. So, those men, besides Omer Pagé, were staying in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir, they were not coming to punch. Those of Sorel, they were not coming to punch.

Q. Whilst working at Mr. Lanctot's house, they were not coming at St. Joseph-de-Sorel to punch?—A. Not at all.

Q. Were they paid, those men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By Mr. Lanctot, or by whom?—A. By the government.

Q. Have you seen them, on pay-days?—A. Yes, I saw them myself getting paid with me.

Q. How do you receive your pay? By cheque or in cash?—A. In cash.

Q. You get your pay in cash, not by cheque?—A. In cash, not by cheque.

Q. Who was the pay-master?—A. Mr. Désiré Champagne.

Cross examined by Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Laroche, when you found out that state of things, you knew that it was not regular, that it was not right?

WITNESS.—Do you say, not right for painters to do outside work?

APPENDIX No. 3

COUNSEL.—Yes, and to get paid by the government.

A. I found that it was not right.

Q. That it was dishonest?—A. For my part, I thought that dishonest.

Q. Why did you wait until the first of March, 1911 before complaining?—A. I did not wait until the first of March.

Q. Why did you not immediately complain to Mr. Papineau, during the summer, immediately after you had discovered that?—A. I had no business to complain to Mr. Papineau.

Q. If you had no business to complain during the summer, what business had you to complain on the first of March?—A. It is because, at the time, I was working for the government.

Q. And now, you don't work any longer for the government?—A. I don't work any more.

Q. Now, who asked you to prepare that declaration?—A. It is Mr. Villard and Mr. Burgeois.

Q. Have you seen Mr. Lamoureux with regard to that?—A. No.

Q. Neither before nor after?—A. No.

Q. You are sure?—A. Sure.

Q. Mr. Villiard, that is Mr. Villiard, the attorney?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there anybody else present, besides Mr. Bourgeois, notary, and Mr. Villiard, when your declaration was signed?—A. There was only myself.

Q. Who was the first to ask you to prepare a declaration?—A. It is Mr. Villiard.

Q. What did he say to you?—A. He asked me if I knew anything with regard to the work going on at Mr. Lanctot's on George street.

Q. You are sure that you have never seen Mr. Lamoureux with regard to that?—A. Yes, sure.

Q. Nor, Thibaudeau?—A. Thibaudeau, I only saw him a moment and that is all; I never mentioned anything to him, never.

Witness discharged.

HERMENEGILDE LAMBERT, sworn.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall:

Q. What is your name sir?—A. Hermenegilde Lambert.

Q. You live in Sorel?—A. At St. Joseph de Sorel.

Q. Are you actually, or have you already been in the employ of the department?—A. I have already been in the employ of the government.

Q. How long were you in the employ of the department?—A. I am not sure if it will be ten years next spring, or if it was ten years last spring.

Q. What was your work at St. Joseph de Sorel?—A. During the first four years I worked as caulker, and in the last years I was foreman of the day labourers.

Q. Who was the next immediately above you in authority?—A. Mr. Gendron.

Q. What is Mr. Gendron's first name? Is it Alexander Gendron?—A. Alex. Gendron.

Q. During the year 1910, were not some men who were working under you sent to work at Mr. Lanctot's and if so under whose orders?—A. I have a man who has been sent to work at Mr. Lanctot's.

Q. Under whose orders?—A. Mr. Champagne came to Mr. Gendron's office and he asked Mr. Joubert, his clerk, in what gang was working Ovila Gouin. Mr. Joubert answered him that Gouin was attached to my gang.

Q. Who is that Mr. Champagne?—A. Mr. Oscar Champagne.

Q. Oscar Champagne, the time-keeper?—A. Yes, the time-keeper.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Your answer was that Avila Gouin was in your gang?—A. I told him that Avila Gouin was in my gang.

Q. I see in exhibit No. 2 produced in this inquiry, and which is now shown you, an entry in the name of Avila Gouin, for a day's work, at the rate of \$1.35 per day, for having worked at Mr. Lanctot's house, in September. Do you mean to say that this is the same Avila Gouin?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, what was it that happened when Mr. Champagne came to ask after Avila Gouin, to Mr. Joubert, Alex. Gendron's clerk?—A. Mr. Champagne said to me; 'since he belongs to your gang, send him along to Mr. Lanctot, to help in the moving at Mr. Lanctot's.

Q. And then, was Avila Gouin sent from your gang at Sorel, to help Mr. Lanctot in his moving?—A. It was myself who sent him.

Q. Did he go there?—A. I presume he did, because every time I have sent him somewhere, I never heard that he had failed to go.

Q. Did he punch before going?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many days did he give to the moving?—A. As for me, I have sent him away two days.

Q. To assist in the moving?—A. I could not say if he has assisted in the moving during the two days, or if he has worked at something else; all I know is that I sent him away two days.

Q. He has punched the two days?—A. He has punched the two days; that is to say he has punched in the morning; at noon, I could not say if he did the punching himself, or if Mr. Joubert had been authorized to punch his card.

Q. Has he been paid for the two days?—A. He did not tell me that he had any time missing. If his time had not been all right, he would have come to me, saying: 'I have not my time put down right.'

Q. Did you see him come with the others to get paid?—A. We always went together to get paid.

Q. You went to get paid with Ovila Gouin?—A. Gouin as the others. We went all together to get paid.

Q. He was there at the appointed time, I suppose? He was always there on every pay-day?—A. He had to take his turn to get paid. On pay-days, we always go there together.

Q. What were the wages of Ovila Gouin?—A. Same as other labourers, \$1.35.

Q. When you say that he was sent to assist Mr. Lanctot in his moving, what moving was it?—A. I suppose it must have been his furniture.

Q. His furniture moved from what place to what place?—A. I took no information about that, sir.

Q. Do you know that Mr. Lanctot, before leaving his George street house, used to live on Ray street, at Sorel?—A. I know that Mr. Lanctot has lived on Ray street.

Q. And when you speak of that moving, do you mean moving from Ray street to George street?—A. I could not say where Mr. Lanctot's household effects were.

Q. Do you know if Mr. Lanctot has moved more than once, several times?—A. That is a thing I could not swear to.

Cross examined by Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Do you remember the date when Gouin did that work?—A. No, sir; I never noticed any date.

Q. You are not in a position to swear that he had worked two days?—A. I am in a position to swear that I sent him to Sorel on two different days.

Q. But you do not know if he has worked there one day or two?—A. I know that I sent him to Mr. Lanctot's on two different days.

Q. And that is all you know?—A. Yes.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. You did not follow him?—A. No, sir, because I had some other men to look after in the ship yard.

Q. You have been discharged from the department on the 28th of December, have you not?—A. On the 28th of December.

Q. Who discharged you?—A. Mr. Papineau. That is, Mr. Papineau suspended me.

Q. It is the same Mr. Papineau you acknowledge being an honest man in the declaration you sign on the 18th of February?—A. The declaration I signed on the 18th of February is nothing.

Q. You mean it is worth nothing?—A. The declaration I made on the 18th of February, it is because they came at my place—They did not tell me it was an affidavit. Mr. Villiard came to my house and asked me if I was willing to give him some notes; that he had been informed I could give him some information about the investigation. I said: 'If the government starts an investigation I can give you some notes;' but I did not tell him it was an affidavit.

Q. And then, what did you do?—A. I gave Mr. Villiard some notes. Then when it appeared in *La Patrie*, I went to one of my uncle's and looking over *La Patrie* I found out that there were too many notes for what I had given.

Q. It means that in the report published by *La Patrie*, there were many things which were not true, which you had never said?

Mr. McDougall.—If you mention *La Patrie* I would like the newspaper to be produced before the committee, in order to be able to follow intelligently the evidence given.

Mr. Laflamme.—You are right.

Q. Go on. What did you do after you had read the newspaper?—A. I went to see Mr. Villiard to tell him that it was not what I had said to him, that I wanted it to be corrected.

Q. Go on. Then Mr. Lambert, what happened?—A. Make the questions yourself, if you please.

Q. What happened then? What is the answer Mr. Villiard gave you?—A. Mr. Villiard told me that it would be corrected.

Q. He did not correct it?—A. Yes, sir. I have in my pocket a copy I signed on the 9th of March.

Q. But the first declaration you had signed it on the 18th of February?—A. I did not notice the date.

Q. It was in the month of February?—A. It was in the month of February.

Q. Then, the first declaration you had not sworn it?

Mr. McDougall objects to that question on the ground that the certificate of oath which appears at the bottom of the declaration of witness is a genuine writing against which there can be no evidence given by witness.

Mr. Laflamme withdraws his question.

Q. Is it your signature which appears at the bottom of that declaration of the 17th of February?—A. Yes, sir; but I did not know it was made under oath.

Q. You found out later on that you had been speaking under oath?—A. It is because when it was published in *La Patrie*, I saw at the bottom of my declaration, it was said that.....I thought I was.....I could not repeat it as it was.

Q. I see what you mean. When you read in *La Patrie* the following words: 'And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."'

(A discussion takes place and witness does not answer.)

Q. Can you read?—A. Yes sir, a little.

Q. Will you, if you please, look at the declaration I put in your hands, read it and then you will tell us if that declaration is right or wrong?

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

(Witness reads the declaration.)

A. Some parts are right but it contains many things I never said.

Q. Then, nobody read the declaration to you before you signed it?—A. Yes, sir; but I insisted to have some things struck off.

Q. And they did not do it?—A. I had a copy given to me. They told me: 'We are going to correct it.' They did not correct it before they sent it here. When I went to see them, after it had been published in *La Patrie*, they told me: 'We are going to correct it.' I asked them for a copy, and the copy I have it in my pocket.

By the Chairman:

Q. When you speak of 'those who corrected it,' who do you mean?—A. Mr. Villiard or Mr. Bourgeois. At all events, Mr. Villiard was the one to correct it.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. At all events, there is a sure thing, it is that you called Mr. Villiard's or Mr. Bourgeois' attention to the fact that the declaration was not right, on the day you signed it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What in your declaration is not right?—A.

Q. The Chairman asks you to show him gradually as you read which paragraphs and parts of paragraphs are not accurate?—A. The words which are not accurate, as long as they have the same meaning, I have nothing to say about that.

Q. Yes?

Mr. McDougall.—You are requested to mention what is not true.

A. That, here, it must not have been understood as... 'He was using the horse and the rig, property of the government....'

The CHAIRMAN.—These words are crossed out?

A. Paragraph 6: 'That every time there had been time and material stolen like that, some pressing work at the department was delayed.' I never said those things.

Mr. LAFLAMME.—Did you say anything which was in your declaration instead of that paragraph 6?

A. No, sir.

Q. Please read paragraphs 7 and 8 of the declaration, and tell us if you have something you would like to strike off?—A. Paragraph 7. I never said anything of the kind. He tried to induce me to say it, but I told him that I knew nothing about that.

Paragraph 7: 'That, if to the losses mentioned above, are added the losses made by the department of wood, iron, cement works, etc., I can say that the amount of the thefts is enormous.'

Q. Please read paragraph 8, the last one, and tell us if it is accurate in some parts and wrong in others?

Mr. McDougall objects to that question.

A. In paragraph 8, that part here is accurate; I said it. But for the rest, I never said it.

Q. Read what is accurate and what is not accurate?—A. 'That I know Mr. Papineau, head of the department, to be an honest man.'

Q. That part is accurate?—A. That part is accurate. That is all I said, for my part.

'But I would add that either from lack of strictness....'

Q. The rest of the paragraph is not accurate?—A. The rest of the paragraph, I did not say that: 'But I would add that either from lack of strictness of character or some other reason, he is unable to maintain on the right path some subordinates who have no scruples in the manipulation of the punch; that, without the benefit of an investigation to find out the guilty parties, the country will keep on making some considerable losses.'

APPENDIX No. 3

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. What you say to-day is the truth?

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to that question on the ground it is illegal.

Question withdrawn.

Witness discharged.

Mr. L. G. PAPINEAU, called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. McDougall:

Mr. Papineau, you are employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, are you?—A. Yes.

Q. What is your official title, or capacity?—A. I am director.

Q. Director of what?—A. Director of the shipyard.

Q. Where?—A. At Sorel.

Q. And as such, I suppose you have the control of the archives, the documents, books and other things?—A. Yes.

Mr. MCDUGALL.—Now, Mr. Chairman, I renew the application I made before; I cannot go on with the examination of Mr. Papineau without the production of the papers asked for; in that connection perhaps I might ask Mr. Papineau if they are here.

The CHAIRMAN.—It has been suggested that he might read the resolution and then he can tell us whether or not the papers are here.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Mr. Papineau, in your official capacity are the following documents under your control at Sorel:—all books, documents, contracts, agreements, letters, correspondence, telegrams, receipts and vouchers, pay lists, punch cards, dials, sheets and records for registering the time and hours of labour of employees of the Department at Sorel, and St. Joseph de Sorel, the whole touching the work and supplies furnished by the Department or any of its employees in connection with the painting, puttying, tinting, varnishing, decorating and finishing the houses and premises of Adelard Lancot, a member of the House of Commons, situate on George Street at Sorel, aforesaid during the years 1909-1910, and also all accounts for such things furnished to Adelard Lancot by Oscar Champagne, an employee of the Department, or by any other employee, together with receipts or vouchers showing payment by Adelard Lancot therefor in whole or in part. And also touching the house premises and lodging rented and occupied by the said A. Lancot on King Street, Sorel, during the year 1908 and especially during October 1908?—A. We telephoned yesterday for those documents and, I understand, a box has arrived at the Department of Marine and Fisheries which is supposed to contain the documents referred to.

Mr. MCDUGALL.—Then, sir, I would ask that they be produced so that I can inspect them. I cannot very well go on with this examination without them and I would therefore ask time to inspect them and that an adjournment be now taken for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN.—That they be produced here?

Mr. MCDUGALL.—I am willing to inspect them at any place, but the order was that the same be left in the hands of this Committee and its officer for inspection.

The Committee then adjourned.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

TUESDAY, March 21, 1911.

Select Committee met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

The Examination of Mr. L. G. Papineau continued.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You were asked, just before the Committee rose on Thursday, if you had in your official capacity under your inspection and control the books mentioned in the last question to you. Your reply was: 'We telephoned yesterday for those documents and, I understand, a box has arrived at the Department of Marine and Fisheries which is supposed to contain the documents referred to.' You were present when the box was opened?—A. Yes.

Q. And an inventory was made of the contents of that box in your presence?—A. Yes, a list of the contents.

Q. If you will allow me to read that inventory we will identify it. The inventory was also made in the presence of the Solicitor General, Mr. Bureau?—A. Yes.

Q. I will now read the inventory: First, letter-book No. 31, running from the 4th April, 1910, to 29th June, 1910. Just identify it please.

The CHAIRMAN.—Do you want that all put on the record?

Mr. McDougall.—Not necessarily. I will read the list to Mr. Papineau and he will identify its contents.

Q. First, there was letter-book No. 31?—A. (After referring to book). From 4th of April, 1910, to 29th of June, 1910.

Q. Letter-book No. 33, from 8th October, 1910, to December 28, 1910?—A. (After examining book). 8th of October, 1910—

Q. Till December 28?—A. December 28, yes.

Q. Then, letter-book No. 34?—A. 34, yes. Begins December 28, 1910, and ends March—

Q. March 13?—A. 13th of March, 1911.

Q. Also a cheque book running from 21st of June, 1910, to March 10, 1911, that book shows the stubbs of cheques?—A. It is a cheque book running from 21st of June, 1910, till March 10, 1911, with the stubbs and a lot of cheques not used.

Q. Also an account book?—A. No, that is the bank book.

Q. No, the account book would be from 31st of December, 1905, to January, 1911?—A. Here it is (producing book), yes, January, 1911.

Q. There is also another account book or cash book showing the amounts received and amounts paid by cheque, &c., from July 21, 1905, to March 10, 1911?—A. This is it (producing book). It begins in July, 1905, and ends March, 1911.

Q. You also have a general ledger running from April 30, 1907. That is a big book?—A. Yes, it is in the other room.

Q. Also an envelope containing a summary of the time charged to Lanctot, and time sheets and cheque for \$375 to the Receiver General?—A. Yes, a summary.

Q. Then a file of letters exchanged on the subject from the 22nd November, 1910, to the 18th January, 1911?—A. Yes, there is our letter file containing the letters exchanged (producing file). There was a letter from Mr. Lanctot and my answer.

Q. That is all I have, Mr. Papineau?—A. Well, there is that pass-book (producing pass-book).

Q. Yes, the bank book?—A. This is my deposit book at Molson's Bank.

Q. In the joint name of L. G. Papineau and A. Baril, from August 14, 1908, to March 11?—A. August 14, 1908, to March 11, 1911.

Q. Now, since these papers were produced, Mr. Papineau, have you forwarded any other papers?

Mr. LAFLAMME.—You say since these papers were produced. You do not mean before the Committee?

Mr. McDougall.—No, before the clerk.

APPENDIX No. 3

The WITNESS.—Yes, another box has been forwarded and must have arrived yesterday, I think.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You were not here yesterday when it was opened?—A. No, sir.

Q. You do not know the contents of that trunk?—A. I have an idea, but I could not say off-hand.

Q. You do not know, in other words?—A. No.

Q. In 1908 and in 1910 the department, particularly the shipyard at Sorel, of which you are the director, had a system of bookkeeping, and keeping the men's time, and so forth?—A. Yes.

Q. It was the same in both these years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were the manager or director of these works?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under you, did you have a number of foremen?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you name some of them? For instance, if you will allow me, there is Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. Jean Baptiste Pagé is one of the foremen. He has charge of the painters.

Q. Was Oscar Champagne one of your officers?—A. He is one of the officers, he is the timekeeper.

Q. Is Outhbert Champagne one of your officers?—A. Yes, he is one of the painters, if I remember rightly.

Q. Has he any particular occupation?—A. Well, he attends to one of the clocks.

Q. He looks after one of the punches for the men's time?—A. Yes.

Q. In what particular department does he look after the punch?—A. He takes care of the clock where the painters check their time.

Q. Who is Désiré Champagne?—A. He is the paymaster.

Q. Generally in the ship-yard?—A. Yes.

Q. Who is Norman Masse?—A. Store-keeper.

Q. What do you mean by store-keeper?—A. He sees that we get the proper stock of goods.

Q. Of supplies?—A. Of supplies.

Q. Paints, oils and varnishes?—A. All kinds of supplies, yes, and he sees to the general distribution of the same.

Q. I suppose the requisition is forwarded to you and on that requisition he sends out the supplies, does he?—A. Yes. Well part of the requisitions are sent direct to the foreman of the paint shops sometimes, and some are sent right through to the saw mill.

Q. To the saw mill? That is with respect to wood?—A. Yes, but they are under the general supervision of the store room.

Q. Of the store-keeper?—A. Of the store-keeper.

Q. That is Norman Massé?—A. Yes.

Q. For instance, if Jean Baptiste Pagé, foreman of the painters, requires some paint for some particular work. To whom would he apply to obtain the paint. A. He would apply to Massé.

Q. To Norman Massé Who is Ulric Latraverse?—A. He is in charge of the Cost Department.

Q. Of the Cost Department?—A. Yes, of the Cost Department.

Q. Will you explain what the Cost Department is?—A. The Cost Department is a branch of the service there to distribute the cost of each piece of work, of each construction which is done in the ship yard.

Q. Well, I suppose that this Cost Department could show the number of men, with the names of the men employed on that particular piece of work and the quantity of paints, and other materials or supplies sent in connection with it?—A. Yes, the time applied to each—

Q. Piece of work?—A. Each particular job is rendered to the Cost Department.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. I suppose the overseer of the Cost Department keeps books of accounts showing these things?—A. Yes.

Q. Any requisition which may be sent to Norman Massé would be sent in writing, would it not?—A. Yes.

Mr. McDougall.—Now, I would like to ask the Clerk if he has any books or accounts sent in from the Cost Department—from Ulric Latraverse's Department or Massé's Department.

The Clerk. There is nothing of that sort.

Mr. McDougall.—Now, Mr. Chairman, comes the difficulty that I have pointed out. I have gone with Mr. Papineau as far as I can go at present but I would like to examine him on these accounts that are lacking.

The Chairman.—Do you think the accounts are quite covered by this Order? I do not suppose there is any objection to producing these accounts, but the Order of Reference confines the production of accounts to what has been done at Mr. Adelard Lanctot's house on George St., Sorel, during the year 1909-10 and also touching the premises and lodgings rented by him on King St., Sorel, during the year 1908 and especially during October of that year.

Mr. McDougall.—Well, during 1910. We want to see the accounts of the paint that went to Lanctot's house.

The Chairman.—Any accounts touching that will have to be produced.

Mr. McDougall.—Yes, during the year 1910, from May to November.

Now has Ulric Latraverse been summoned.

The Clerk.—Yes, and he is present.

Mr. McDougall.—And Norman Massé also?

The Clerk.—No sir.

Mr. McDougall.—If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, I will put Mr. Latraverse into the box now and ask him if he has the papers. If not the Committee will take under advisement the request I will make that he be sent to get them.

The examination of M. L. G. Papineau was suspended.

ULRIC LATRAVERSE, sworn.

Examined by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. You are in the employ of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Sorel, in the 'cost' department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your official title?—A. Clerk for the estimate of the work done in the government shipyard at Sorel.

Q. You do some bookkeeping?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Books or sheets?—A. Yes, sir, books.

Q. Are the names of the men in those books?—A. The names of the men are entered for the work done in the government shipyards.

Q. Is the material, as paint and other material, entered in those books?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you keep those books?—A. No, sir, but I have the management of them.

Q. Who keeps those books in your department?—A. It is a young man, named Prudhomme.

Q. What is his first name?—A. Albert Prudhomme.

Q. He is under you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The books and the accounts are in your care?—A. Yes, sir. I look over them after him, and I know them just as well as he.

Q. You see that he makes the entries?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Have you in your possession some book or account of your department showing the names of the men who have worked at building or painting Mr. Lanctot's house, the member for Richelieu?—A. No, sir, it is not entered in my books.

Q. Have you a book or statement of the department showing the quantity of paint or material supplied and delivered to Mr. Lanctot for the painting of his house in 1910?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have not got them with you here but at Sorel, in your department, do such accounts exist?—A. No, no.

Q. Have I to understand you to say that you have no account, you have no book, no sheets showing that some men have worked at Mr. Lanctot's or that some paint or other material has been supplied during the year 1910 for the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. No, sir, I have nothing of the kind in my department.

Q. Is there another department where those accounts should be kept, either in some books or on some sheets?—A. They might be direct charges coming from the chief accountant.

Q. Who is the chief accountant?—A. Mr. Alfred Baril.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Are you working under Mr. Baril?—A. Under Mr. Baril.

Q. You are under Mr. Baril?—A. I am under Mr. Baril.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. To fix the cost of a piece of work made in the government shipyards should the accounts, even if they had been authorized by Mr. Alfred Baril, the chief accountant, necessarily pass into your hands, in the 'cost' department?—A. No, sir, I am supposed to have only the cost of the work done for the Marine Department in the shipyards.

Q. Then you have no account of the work done for Mr. Lanctot, either in reference to paint supplied or to men or the time of men?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever received any information as to the work going on at Mr. Lanctot's during the year 1910?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then, there is no open account in your department mentioning the painting done or the time of the men who have worked at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. No, sir.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Latraverse, you keep an account of the material used actually either for the repairs to the government boats or the building of the boats or any other work done for the government?—A. For building or repairs in the government shipyards, only.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. In the accounts you keep in that way for the work done at the government shipyards, do you receive from time to time from Jean-Baptiste Page, foreman of the painting department, the time of the men and the material supplied?—A. I receive that when they work on a boat or on any other structure, he gives me the amount of paint used and the time of the men.

Q. It is the ordinary practice, the usual practice: Jean-Baptiste Page sends you the time of the men?—A. Every day he gives me the time of the men and he enters in his book the amount of paint used, he gives me the book and I take from his book the amount of paint used.

Q. Have you ever received from Jean-Baptiste Page an account for the time of the men or for the paint supplied in order to paint Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Latraverse, what you said about the distribution of the cost of material applies also to the hand labour for the government works?—A. Yes, sir. I enter only the work done for the department, the hand labour as well as the material used.

Q. So that if to-morrow I was going to the department store to borrow, say, fifty pounds of paint and two gallons of oil or varnish, to put them back afterwards, you would have nothing to do with it, yourself?—A. I have nothing to do with it.

Q. And the same answer, I suppose, would apply to the borrowing of men, of painters, for instance, to do some work and I would pay them?—A. It is the same thing. They cannot report that to me except when it is some work for the government.

Q. Then, in that case, if you had no notice of it, who would be the officer of the department at Sorel who would have to keep track of that loan of material and of day labourers or painters, who would take note of it?—A. For the workingmen, it can be the one who keeps the time of the men, for instance, and for the material those who look after the store, the one who has charge of the store.

Q. Who would be those two persons?—A. Mr. Champagne, to keep the time of his men.

Q. Oscar Champagne?—A. Oscar Champagne; and for the store, Mr. Norman Massé is the man.

Q. Is it not a fact that Mr. Page, as head of the painting department, has always a big stock of paint on hand, of which he gives an account from time to time, so as to allow you to make your accounts?—A. He always has a big stock on hand because he cannot go and get it by small quantities at the store.

Examination of Mr. PAPINEAU resumed.

By Mr. McDougall.

Q. In June 1910 were you at Sorel throughout the month?—A. Most of the time, yes.

Q. Can you speak a little more precisely, Mr. Papineau? Were you not in Sorel during the whole month of June, 1910?—A. Well, I was away once or twice during the month.

Q. Do you remember the dates of your absence?—A. I remember that I was away on the Thursday, that was a holiday, and I remember being in Montreal when there was the demonstration at the Dollard Monument or rather the Maisonneuve Monument. I think it was the last day of May.

Q. The 31st of May?—A. That was a Sunday, and I think I was there the Saturday previous.

Q. In May? On the Saturday and Sunday the last two days of May you were in Montreal?—A. Yes.

Q. During the month of June you were in Sorel?—A. Most of the time. Now and then I came to Montreal or Ottawa.

Q. Did you know that men from the Department with materials supplied from the Department, such as paints, oils, and so forth, were working at Adelard Lanctôt's house during June and July?—A. No sir.

Q. In the course of the year 1910?—A. No sir.

Q. Were you ever informed of this by anybody?—A. I was informed of it in November.

Q. If men's time or materials of the Department were borrowed for any outside operations other than those of the Government itself at Sorel to whom would the application for these be made?

Mr. LAFLAMME objected to the question, on the ground that it was too general.

APPENDIX No. 3

Mr. McDougall asked the Stenographer to repeat the question, and reframed it as follows:—

Q. If men's time or materials of the Department were borrowed during 1910 for painting at Mr. Lanctot's house, to whom would the application for these be made?

—A. I would expect it to be made to the Director, if he was there.

Q. The Director is yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. Have any of your sub-officials or foremen the right to farm out paints or men's time to others than the Department itself?

Mr. LAFLAMME objected to the question.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that question is all right.

Question repeated.

WITNESS: I would consider the Assistant- Director could do the same, could use the same powers as I use.

Q. Who do you call the Assistant Director?—A. Mr. Terreault.

Q. What is his first name?—A. H. A. Terreault.

Q. With the exception of yourself and Terreault aforesaid have any of your men—Jean Baptiste Pagé, or Oscar Champagne or Albert Baril, or any other the right without your permission to give paint or deliver paint to Mr. Lanctot or anybody else or to give to Mr. Lanctot or anybody else men's time for the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house or any body else's property in Sorel?—A. I consider they should advise the authority.

Q. Who is yourself or the assistant?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you ever advised during the year 1910 of what was being done at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. As I said before, I was advised in November after the work was done.

Q. Do you know if Mr. Terreault was ever advised?—A. I don't expect so, not to my knowledge.

Q. If your Assistant, Mr. Terreault, had been so advised would you not have known of it?

The CHAIRMAN.—That is hardly a proper question. Mr. Terreault can be called to explain that himself.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Would it have been Terreault's duty to refer such a matter to you?—A. We generally have knowledge of what the other does. Of course in the press of business sometimes a thing will not be reported.

Mr. GEOFFRION objected that the investigation was taking too wide a range, contending that they were not there to investigate the administration of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think we are just about on the verge of that already.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Mr. Terreault would act in your absence, if you were present the authority would have to come from you?—A. Well, he might order a thing when I am not there, or even when I am there.

Q. In a matter which would extend over four or five months, such as the furnishing of supplies and men for the painting of Lanctot's house, would it be the duty of Mr. Terreault to report that to you if the instructions had been given by him?—A. I do not think Mr. Terreault had anything to do with that particular piece of work.

Q. The question is if he had would he not for an operation extending over several months, say from June to November, give you some information of it?—A. That is a question of opinion.

Mr. LAFLAMME.—The same objection.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Now, in November you were informed that painting had been done for Mr. Lanctot. Who gave you the information?—A. Mr. Oscar Champagne told me one day. He said, 'Have you heard from Mr. Lanctot?' I told him 'Nothing in particular.' I asked why. 'Well,' he said, 'if you have not, you will receive a letter from him because we have rendered an account to Mr. Lanctot, an account for work done,' and a day or two after I received a letter from Mr. Lanctot.

Q. Have you got the letter, Mr. Papineau? Will you look at the letter now shown you, marked Exhibit '16' and say if that is the letter you refer to?—A. That is the letter I refer to.

Q. Will you read it, please?

WITNESS read letter in French.

The CHAIRMAN.—Read it now in English, please.

WITNESS reads:—

EXHIBIT NO. 16.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

OTTAWA, NOVEMBER 22, 1910.

MR. L. G. PAPINEAU, Director of the Ship yards at St. Joseph de Sorel.

DEAR SIR.—I am sending you herewith my cheque to the amount of \$375.62 in payment of your account for wages of men supplied by the Department of Marine & Fisheries who have worked at my house. Please accept my sincere thanks.

Your devoted servant,

ADELARD LANCTOT.

Q. Look at that exhibit and say if it is the cheque you received?—A. That is the cheque alluded to.

Q. When you received that cheque had you the account?—A. Yes.

Q. Who gave you the account?—A. The account was with the letter.

Q. The account was enclosed in the letter?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you look at Exhibit No. 2 and say if that is the account or a duplicate of it?—A. Well, it is the same account, the same figures; yes, that is the account.

Q. You had not seen that account before you received it with the enclosure of the cheque. You had not seen that cheque at all until you received it from Mr. Lanctot?—A. No.

Q. Mr. Champagne had not shown it to you?—A. No.

Q. From what books or records could that account have been taken?—A. From the time-books of the time-keeper.

Q. Oscar Champagne is the time-keeper?—A. Yes.

Q. You replied to that letter on 2nd December, Mr. Papineau?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Was there any reason that you can give for replying on 2nd December instead of at once?—A. Well, it required a little time to be sure where we were standing with it.

Q. Where what?—A. How we were standing.

Q. While you made your enquiry from the 22nd November to the 2nd December? A. I replied on the 2nd December, I think.

Q. Look at Exhibit No. 12 and say if that is the reply to the letter enclosing Mr. Lanctot's cheque which you received?—A. Yes sir.

Q. That is the date, the 2nd December?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Now then, the question is between 22nd November and the 2nd December you made enquiries with respect to what went to make up the cheque of \$375?—A. I enquired to know that the time was correct, and then I answered Mr. Lanctot and acknowledged receipt of his letter and cheque.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. To be applied as he requested. He requested you to apply it to the payment of the account?—A. Yes sir.

Q. To whom did you enquire as to the time, Oscar Champagne?—A. Yes.

Q. Anybody else?—A. He would refer to Pagé of course.

Q. Pagé of course was not the timekeeper. Pagé was the foreman of the painters?—A. Yes, but he had the men under his orders.

Q. The men who did the work. Whose hand-writing is that account in, Mr. Papineau?—A. The account?

Q. Yes, Exhibit "2"?—A. I believe it is Champagne's.

Q. And was the cheque filled out in full just as you see it today when you received it?—A. Yes, this is the cheque as I received it.

Q. Or was it signed really by Mr. Lanctot and filled in?—A. No, no.

Q. Received as it is?—A. Yes.

Q. When you received that cheque you did not apply it at once as required by Mr. Lanctot, did you, Mr. Papineau?—A. Well, the moment I had acknowledged receipt of course I was responsible for the amount. Then in the course of another month I sent it to the bank, toward the end of the month.

Q. Will you look at your bank-book and tell us how the account is kept in the bank? It is kept in your name and Mr. Barill's, the accountant, jointly?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you look at the entry of January 11, 1911?—A. Yes.

Q. State if you find the deposit of the cheque there to your credit?—A. Yes, January 11, \$375.62.

Q. You made the deposit that day?—A. The cheque was cashed on that day by the bank, because I see it is marked paid on the 11th. It had been sent at the end of the month.

By the Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Which month?—A. December. Now, I had first endorsed for the deposit to our credit at Molson's Bank. That is the way we generally endorse a cheque when it is made in the joint names of Papineau and Baril. The cheque is made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was not sufficient, so I had it returned.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Returned to whom?—A. To me, and endorsed by the Marine and Fisheries Department, Sorel.

Q. The Bank returned it to you, you mean?—A. So as to make it complete.

Q. Well, it had been sent into the Bank at the end of December but not at the end of November. It was received in November?—A. The end of December. I got it at the beginning. I had it, you see on the 22nd December, and I kept it a whole month.

Q. Were you making inquiries during this month to see whether the cheque would be accepted or retained by the Department, or is there any other explanation you wish to offer?—A. There is no explanation to offer.

Q. Well, it is not quite in the ordinary course to keep a cheque a month. I want to know if there is any particular reason why.—There is no reason beyond the one you offer?—A. No.

Q. All right. That amount was placed to your credit and you drew I think a deposit receipt. It went to the Receiver General?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Will you show us that transaction, please. Will you look at Exhibit '17'?

Witness shown Exhibit 17.

A. Yes.

Q. And say what it is?—A. Well, that is a cheque drawing on our deposit with the Bank so as to have a draft to the credit of the Receiver General.

Q. That is, a deposit receipt or a cheque?—A. That is a cheque on the funds we had to our name.

Q. That is a cheque paid by the two of you, Papineau and Baril, for \$375.62 to be put to the credit of the Receiver General?—A. Yes.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Is it on the face of the cheque?—A. 'Refund from A. Lanctot for labour supplied'.

Q. After you got the deposit receipt did you forward it to the Receiver General? You sent it to the Deputy Minister, Mr. Johnston, didn't you?—A. Yes.

Q. There was some correspondence which ensued between you and Mr. Johnston. (Reads letter.)

EXHIBIT No. 18.

January 12, 1911.

SIR.—I beg to forward herewith, certificate of deposit No. 10 to the credit of the Receiver General, of a sum of \$375.62, being amount of refund re labour supplied to Mr. A. Lanctot, Sorel. I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

ALEX. JOHNSTON, Esq.,
Deputy Minister Marine.

L. G. PAPINEAU,
Director of Ship Yard.

Q. Now, would you read the reply?—A. (Reads):

EXHIBIT No. 19.

OTTAWA, January 16, 1911.

SIR.—I have received from you, as per your letter of the 12th inst., receipt No. 10, to the credit of the Receiver General, for the sum of \$375.62, being amount of refund re labour supplied to Mr. A. Lanctot, Sorel. Before this can be sent over to the Auditor General, a statement of this labour is required. Kindly see that this is sent here immediately. I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. JOHNSTON,
Deputy Minister of Marine & Fisheries.

Q. You did not forward the account with the cheque?—A. No.

Q. You later, in reply to the Deputy Minister, sent the account?—A. Sent the account.

Q. Is that contained in that file?—A. There is a copy of it.

Q. Will you look at that and see if it is a copy of what you sent?—A. It is not the copy I sent. You see, this is my file at Sorel.

Q. That is an exact duplicate of what you sent to the Deputy Minister?—A. Probably the Deputy Minister has the exact counter-part.

Q. That is the copy retained by you?—A. Yes sir.

Q. You furnished the account and the account is there?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you look at account Exhibit '2'; compare it with the account sent to the Deputy Minister. You see in the account, Exhibit "2", the dates are not in consecutive order. In the account furnished to the Deputy Minister the dates are in consecutive order—the months. Allow me to point out to you that June, July, August, September, October, November, are all in consecutive order in the account furnished to the Deputy Minister?—A. Yes.

Q. But in the account furnished by Champagne the dates are not, sometimes; July is put after August and September after November?—A. Don't you like it better in the logical order?

Q. I prefer it in consecutive order, but I am anxious to know why?—A. I wanted to put it in logical order. The amount is the same.

By Mr. Brodeur:

Q. The amounts opposite each name are the same?—A. Yes.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. In sending the account to the Deputy Minister, was the account made in your Department, or was a fresh one made by Mr. Champagne?—A. No, I think it was made in my Department

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Well, you have Exhibit 2, the account. Can you tell us from the books which are now here or from any records in your Department at what particular dates or date, July, August, September, October and November, the various men whose names are written there worked at Adelard Lanctot's house and at what other dates in those said months they worked for the Department, specifying where, and giving their job numbers, if there is such a thing?—A. No, I could not find those readily in the books.

Q. Where can the information be got?—A. I do not keep the books myself.

Q. Who would keep track of it?—A. The time-book is kept by Oscar Champagne.

Q. Will he be in a position from the papers we have here to tell this?—A. I think so.

Time-book produced.

Q. Will you take communication of the book now shown to you containing the headline, 'Department Marine and Fisheries, Canada. Government Ship Yard, Sorel, Que., River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 1910. Pay List No. 144,' and say what it is?—A. Well, it is the—

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. What date is that?

Mr. McDougall—I will identify it.

A. It is a copy of the pay list, the pay roll of the yard, for the half month from the first of June to the 15th.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. From what date?—A. From the 1st of June to the 15th of June, 1910.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. And it is a book showing what? Referring to what?—A. To the time the men have been employed.

Q. Of the employees of the Department?—A. The employees of the Department.

Q. At what work?—A. Well, all work.

Q. It is a record of the time the men put in?—A. Yes.

Q. On the St. Lawrence Ship Channel?—A. It is a record of the time they put in at the ship yard.

Q. At the ship yard in connection with the River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, is it?—A. Yes.

Q. That shows where the men work, doesn't it?—A. It shows that they were paid; that they gave so much time and that they were paid for it.

Q. That they gave so much time to what? What does that record show?—A. It shows the time the men have worked for the Department.

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. The time the department would be responsible for them, isn't that it?

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. That is the pay list showing the time the men have worked at some particular place?—A. Well, they worked at Sorel for the ship yard.

Q. But does not that particular record refer to the St. Lawrence Ship Channel?—A. Well, all our work over there is marked under that heading.

Q. Oh, that is a general heading, is it?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there anything in this pay list to show where these particular men whose names are down there worked?—A. Not on the pay list, no.

Q. Not on the pay list. At page 331 is found the name of Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. Yes.

Q. Foreman?—A. Yes.

Q. Number of man 276. Will you explain what the man's number is?—A. Well, each man has a number for reference.

- Q. For reference?—A. For reference, either for payment or for any other purpose.
- Q. So 276 is Jean Baptiste Pagé's 'man number', let us call it?—A. Yes.
- Q. Do you find the name Adel. Alley?—A. Yes, 279.
- Q. His number is 279. Do you find Henri Proulx there?—A. Yes.
- Q. Number 283?—A. 283.
- Q. Do you find Henri Paul's name?—A. Yes, 287.
- Q. 287, do you find Alberie Letendre?—A. 292.
- Q. Do you find Alfred Douaire?—A. Yes.
- Q. 295—A. 295.
- Q. Do you find Napoleon Laroche?—A. Yes.
- Q. 299?—A. 299.
- Q. Do you find Octave Lafreniere?—A. Yes.
- Q. 301?—A. Yes.
- Q. Do you find Arthur Lavallee?—A. Yes.
- Q. 304?—A. 304.
- Q. Do you find Louis Paul?—A. Yes.
- Q. 306?—A. 306.
- Q. Do you find Joseph Kane?—A. Yes.
- Q. No. 310?—A. Yes.
- Q. Do you find Theodore Emond?—A. Yes, 314.
- Q. His number is 314?—A. Yes.
- Q. Do you find Arthur Trempe?—A. Yes.
- Q. 320?—A. Yes.
- Q. Do you find Edmond Brault?—A. Yes.
- Q. His number is 321?—A. 321.
- Q. Do you find Adelard Letendre?—A. 330.
- Q. Do you find Omer Page?—A. Yes.
- Q. No. 342?—A. Yes 342.
- Q. At the end of this pay list, No. 144, do you find a certificate?—A. Yes.
- Q. Signed by D. Champagne, paymaster to the following effect: 'I certify that the above men have been paid at the dates recorded'. A. Yes.
- Q. Is it countersigned by anybody?—A. Not this.
- Q. This one is not countersigned?—A. No, the copy we send to the Department is countersigned.
- Q. Who would it be countersigned by?—A. I countersign it; that (indicating exhibit) is the record that we keep at the yard.
- Q. Well then we will have to get the original. Is it not countersigned by Oscar Champagne, the timekeeper, also?—A. Yes.
- Q. But this one in particular has not been countersigned by him?—A. Well, this book need not be countersigned.
- Q. Well now, I have read you the names and the numbers of certain men who worked?—A. Yes.
- Q. The amounts placed on this pay list opposite the names showing the number of days' labour they made during that half month of June, with the amounts paid to them?—A. Yes.
- Q. And the rate of the wages they are paid is entered here?—A. Yes.
- Q. So that we can make up from the names of those men the amounts paid to them and the time each man gave?—A. Yes.
- Q. The original of this book is in the Department at Ottawa?—A. Yes.
- Mr. McDougall.—I will try, Mr. Chairman, to shorten this up, and with that object I will ask a general question, I do not want to go into all the details.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Will you look at Pay Sheet No. 145?—A. Yes.

Q. Pay lists 145, 146, 147 and down to 157 inclusive cover the whole period—no,

APPENDIX No. 3

down to 156, it should be, I do not want to go beyond the date of the account. A. This is the first half of December.

Q. This is the first half of December?—A. Yes.

Q. It will be down to No. 155, inclusively, then? 155 is the last; will you look at pay lists 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, and 155 inclusively—will you just take a hurried look at the certificates and say if these are all—A. These are copies of the pay lists.

Q. Pay rolls of the same nature as No. 144?—A. Yes.

Q. And the names of these men I have been reading are in there?—A. They are in the employ of the Department and were paid according to the amount shown opposite their names.

Q. And their numbers?—A. And their numbers.

Q. Now apart from the numbers which the workmen have is there a number put upon the job or upon each particular piece of work? Is each job numbered also?—A. They are not shown on the pay list.

Q. It is not shown on the pay list, but is there such a thing?—A. Yes, every job is numbered.

Q. Where can we find the evidence of the job number?—A. Well, the job numbers are kept in the assistant director's office.

Q. In the assistant director's office, Mr. A. Terrault's office?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, after you received this—you had no knowledge of anything that was going on at Mr. Adelard Lanctot's until November 10, and then on receiving his cheque you made inquiries about it?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you inquire whether this work had been done?—A. Well, I got a statement of the time given.

Q. From whom?—A. From Mr. Champagne.

Q. Is it here?—A. And after it had been checked—

Q. Now this time which you obtained there, is this time which you obtained from Oscar Champagne contained in the detailed summary, the summary with details in the papers now shown to you. (Document produced.)—A. Well, there is no signature to this, so I cannot say—it seems to have the time shown in the account.

Q. Well, these are the papers that were sent up to us, of course I want accurate information?—A. I do not know any further about that, myself—

Q. For instance you see—A. The account is signed but this is not.

Q. The account is signed?—A. Yes.

Q. But the particulars, or the apparent particulars covering June, July, August, September, October and November, with a whole lot of slips apparently showing how many days' work the men put in are not signed by anybody?—A. I do not see any signatures.

Q. You do not know anything about this yourself?—A. I have not prepared them myself?

Q. How did you verify Mr. Lanctot's cheque for \$375?

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. Is it usual for Mr. Champagne to sign these time slips?—A. No.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Mr. Champagne furnished you that account?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he give you the details, the days and the dates that each man worked in the months of June, July, August and September?—A. Yes, the account is there.

Q. The account simply says they worked in June so many days, in general, but does not show on what days in June; for instance Octave Lafreniere worked 16 days in June?—A. Well, he must have taken that from his time book.

Q. Annexed to that statement is a number of slips there?—A. Yes, that has not been certified by anybody.

Q. You will not swear as to the correctness of this?—A. I have not compared it myself.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Whose handwriting is it in, Mr. Papineau. I want to get information as to the times and dates. You do not know whose handwriting the particulars are in?—A. I am not positive, no.

Q. Is it in Mr. Champagne's handwriting?—A. No.

Q. Is it in Mr. Emery's?—A. I do not think so.

By the Chairman:

Q. Whose handwriting do you think it is in? Some person in your office?—A. Well, if I knew I would be able to swear.

Q. You might not be able to swear positively, but tell us whose handwriting you think it is in and then we can call him and find out whether that is the man or not?—A. I believe it has been made in the accountant's department.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. In Mr. Baril's Department?—A. Yes.

Q. I want to know how it is made up if I can get the particulars?—A. I think it was taken from the time book showing the dates, the details.

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. Do you know by whom these time sheets were supplied?—A. Well, they are on the regular form of the Department.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Here is one, for instance, which tells that Octave Laferriere, whose man number is 301, 'charge account of Lanctot,' who apparently worked on the 3rd, 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th, six days; then again in June he apparently worked on the 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 27th, 28th, 29th and 30th of June, 10 days—what I want to ascertain is who kept these particulars?—A. Well, they were kept with the time book, by the checker.

Q. By the time checker, that is Champagne?—A. Yes.

Q. When you made inquiries about Mr. Lanctot's check and the work that had been done for him, did you get the job number that was allotted to him in the Government account?—A. I don't think so.

Q. Do you know if there was a job number allotted to Mr. Lanctot?—A. I do not believe there was one.

Q. You would know, you are the controlling director?—A. Well, we issue about 6,000 job numbers in the year.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. How many?—A. 6,000, I suppose.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Can you tell us whether there is any account at all kept with Mr. Lanctot in the Government books. There must be a letter, journal or something?—A. Yes, well the accountant has that.

Q. After November, and after receiving the check, on or about December 12th, 1910, did you receive an account for the paints and other things supplied to Adelard Lanctot in connection with his house on George St.?—A. Yes, the same week that I got the check I got a detailed account of the material supplied for the work at Mr. Lanctot's.

Q. From whom did you get this?—A. I got that, I think it was prepared by Mr. Champagne too.

Q. By Oscar Champagne?—A. Yes, the handwriting is Mr. Champagne's but it was prepared from the memorandum of Mr. Page.

Q. What has Mr. Champagne to do with it? He is only the men's timekeeper?—A. Well, he could do writing anyway.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Yes, all right, but can you?—A. The account is here, here is the certificate of Mr. Page.

Q. Have you the account here?
(Account filed).

EXHIBIT NO. 20.

MONS. A. LANCTOT

1910 Dr. to Marine & Fisheries Dept.
P.O. Address, Sorel.

16 Novembre, 1910.

Juin 3	150 lbs. de Mastic at 2 cents.	\$ 3 00
" 3	6 Paquets pointe a vitre at 5 cents.	0 30
Sept. 19	200 lbs. peinture préparée at 11 cents.	22 00
" 19	4 galls. huile at \$1.00.	4 00
Oct. 13	300 lbs. peinture jaune at 11 cents.	33 00
" 14	6 galls. rubbing varnish at \$2.75.	16 50
" 27	2 galls. peinture grise at \$1.25.	2 50
		<hr/> \$81 30

Work performed, materials delivered, measured by

J. B. PAGE,
Foreman,

Certified prices fair and just.

Resident Engineer.

Received from the Department of Marine & Fisheries, in full of the above account, the sum of

.....Dollars.....day of.....191.....

Q. You produce that as the account which was given to you by Oscar Champagne was it, or was it by Page?—A. It was handed me I think by Mr. Champagne.

Q. Are you not sure, can you not tell us positively whether it was Page gave it to you or Champagne?—A. I think it was handed me by Mr. Champagne.

Q. By Champagne, yes; at what time now?—A. Well, in the same week; that was on the 2nd December—well it was during that week.

Q. Some time after the 2nd December?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. When did you get the account—from Mr. Champagne, was it? Was it when you got the cheque from Mr. Lanctot or after that?—A. The account was with Mr. Lanctot's cheque.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Now, you received the cheque, if I remember aright, about the 21st or 22nd November?—A. Well, about that time.

Q. And you answered it on the 2nd December?—A. Yes.

Q. This account you have just produced, Exhibit 20, was given you between these two dates or after 2nd of December?—A. After.

Q. After 2nd of December?—A. Yes.

Q. This was given you by Mr. Champagne or by Mr. Page, you think Mr. Champagne, as being the quantity of paints and other things furnished to Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes.

Q. For the painting of his house?—A. Yes.

Q. When did you see Mr. Lanctot in connection with this account, Exhibit No. 20?—A. Well, I saw him—at the time of receiving the letter I expected to see him within a few days and then I acknowledged the receipt; when I saw he was not

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

turning up in Sorel I acknowledged the receipt of the letter, and a few days afterwards I had occasion to see him in Sorel and I mentioned the account.

Q. The account; which account, the account Mr. Champagne had given you?—

A. The account for material. I told him I thought the best plan would be to have the same quantities of material returned to the department. He was quite willing that I have that done for him.

Q. That was the last communication you had with him on that subject?—A. I do not recall any other.

Q. Well, in writing you, for instance, enclosing the cheque to pay for the mens' time, did not he also tell you there would be an account for material, for paints? Did he say anything about that?—A. I do not think he said anything but I knew it about the same time.

Q. Then you knew it from Mr. Champagne? Well then he agreed to return the materials to the department?—A. Yes.

Q. Well how were the materials got?—A. About the same time; about that time there was the manager of the Mount Royal Paint and Varnish Company—

Q. Mr. Lamontagne?—A. Mr. Lamontagne—happened to be in Sorel and as he was one of the men supplying material for the department at one time and another, I gave him a list of what we required; you see the list was according to that memoranda.

Q. The memoranda of Mr. Champagne? Exhibit No. 20?—A. Yes. Mr. Page, so that Mr. Lamontagne agreed to send the goods to the department, and I gave him my personal cheque.

Q. Have you any cheque with you, Mr. Papineau?—A. Yes. Then at the next—

Q. Will you exhibit your cheque?—A. Yes I will—and the next time Mr. Lanctot called I showed him a copy of the receipt of Mr. Lamontagne and he paid me back the money I had disbursed. (After making search). I had it this morning.

THE CHAIRMAN.—You will find it and produce it later on.

The WITNESS.—Yes.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You gave Mr. Lamontagne—A. Oh, here it is I think. (After examining document). No.

The CHAIRMAN.—The cheque of Mr. Papineau to the paint firm will be marked Exhibit No. 21.

(EXHIBIT No. 21).

Montreal, 12th December, 1910.

La Banque d'Epargne la Cite et du District de Montreal.

Payez à l'ordre de T. Lamontagne.
Quatre-vingt deux	60
	<hr/> 100
\$82.60	
<hr/> 100	

L. G. PAPINEAU.

Endorsed: 'Je, soussigné, certifie que le montant du present cheque est Quatre-Vingt deux, 60 dollars.

Also endorsed:

E. LAMONTAGNE.
T. LAMONTAGNE.

APPENDIX No. 3

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You gave your cheque to Mr. Lamontagne, the agent of the Mount Royal Colour and Varnish Company?—A. Yes.

Q. And that is reported to Montreal, or by correspondence, as for goods supplied on or about December 12, paints and materials, to correspond, I suppose, with Exhibit 20?—A. Yes.

Q. You will look at Exhibit No. 13 and say if that is the—A. Yes, I have got the receipt from Lamontagne, you see. (Producing document).

(EXHIBIT No. 22).

Mount Royal Colour and Varnish Co., Ltd.

Montreal, Que., Dec. 12, 1910.

Vendu au Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Sorel, P. Q.

A/c Director.

5740	150 lbs. putty	0 02	3 00
	6 packs. glazier paint	0 10	0 60
	200 lbs. R. M. paint, green	0 11	22 00
	4 gals. D.B. linseed oil	1 00	4 00
	300 lbs. yellow paint	0 11	33 00
	6 gals. rubbing varnish	2 75	16 50
	2 grey paint	1 25	2 50
			<hr/>
			\$81 60

Mount Royal Colour and Varnish Co., Limited.

Paid, Dec. 13, 1910.

Per Choquette.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You gave your cheque in advance on December 11 to Mr. Lamontagne?—A. Yes.

Q. On December 12 the goods were sent on to the department as shown by Exhibit No. 13, and Lamontagne, or his house, sent you a receipt which bears the imprint, 'December 13'?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which you produced as Exhibit No. 22?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now that was a personal transaction between you and Mr. Lanctot, and your personal cheque went for the payment of the goods and Mr. Lanctot paid you back \$81.60 personally, did he not?—A. Yes.

Q. Nothing of that went through the government's books, there were no entries of that transaction at all?—A. Well, except that the goods were checked when they came in.

Q. The goods were checked when they came in?—A. Yes.

Q. And on the face of Exhibit No. 13 appears the counter-signature of Arthur Lavallee?—A. Yes, he checked the goods when they came back.

Q. That is to say you turned the goods into the department for which you had paid by your personal cheque?—A. Yes. You notice that this is marked 'no charge.'

Q. I do not know what that means?—A. That means the department has nothing to pay for them.

Q. The department never paid for those goods?—A. No.

Q. It was yourself?—A. Mr. Lanctot paid for them.

Q. That is he refunded the amount to you?—A. Yes.

Q. But you paid for these goods?—A. Yes.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. As an act of friendship for Mr. Lanctot, I suppose?—A. Well, just as a matter of Mr. Lanctot not being there, you see.

Q. Yes?—A. I did the transaction with Lamontagne for Lanctot.

Q. And he reimbursed you?—A. Yes.

Q. He also paid a little more than \$81.60, there was some freight paid for?—A. There was freight, yes, he paid a dollar odd.

Q. There are no entries of this transaction in the government books?—A. No.

Q. Have you a purchasing agent or a contract agent in the department at Sorel?—A. Not at Sorel, sir.

Q. Well, at Ottawa?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who deals with supplies required for Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is his name?—A. Mr. Cecil Doutre.

Q. Did he have anything to do with supplies at Lantoct's house?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was he required to get them in any way?—A. No, sir.

Q. When supplies are required for the department who is requested to obtain them, is it not the purchasing agent, Mr. Doutre?—A. Well, we make requisitions.

Q. You make requisitions?—A. Yes.

Q. And they are sent to Ottawa?—A. Yes.

Q. Sent to Mr. Roy at Ottawa, are they?—A. The requisitions are sent to Mr. Doutre.

Q. Directly to Mr. Doutre?—A. Yes.

Q. And on these requisitions he goes out and makes the contracts and purchases?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there ever a requisition sent to Mr. Doutre to purchase supplies for Mr. Lanctot?—A. No, sir.

Q. Now in reference to these pay lists, Mr. Desire Champagne pays them out of moneys which are supplied to him on your cheque, or on the cheque of you and Mr. Baril, and you obtain these moneys on application to the Department, do you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For instance, I want to put one general question: I find that from your cheque book you handed to Desire Champagne for different pay rolls amounts varying from fifteen and sixteen to seventeen and eighteen thousand dollars. A. Yes.

Q. That is to say with moneys obtained from the department at Ottawa?—A. Yes, they put—

Q. I do not want to go through all the letter books, I have made a summary of them because I do not want to lose the time of the Committee.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Explain, Mr. Papineau, how these payments are made?—A. When a pay roll, for instance, is made and ready, the Department issue a cheque in our favor—in favor of L. G. Papineau and A. Baril.

Q. Do you send the requisition yourself for the amount of money you require, or how is it done?—A. Yes.

Q. Or do you send a pay list and ask for the money?—A. We send the pay list.

Q. You send the pay list to the Department?—A. Send the pay list to the Department. The Department issue a cheque in favor of L. G. Papineau and A. Baril. The cheque is deposited to our joint account, to our credit at the Bank. Then we make a cheque to draw from that amount. We make the cheque to draw according to the pay for the half month.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. And that amount is handed to Desire Champagne?—A. The cheque is made in favor of Desire Champagne, the paymaster.

APPENDIX No. 3

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. It is made payable to the order of somebody else? But do you mention on the cheque the pay list which you intend to pay? How is the cheque drawn. A. Well, it is drawn in favour of Desire Champagne, the paymaster, and it is signed by both of us.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. So Desire Champagne is put in possession of the money. A. He is put in possession of the money.

Q. He is put in possession of the actual cash and pays the men?—A. He pays the men.

Q. And shows at the foot of the pay roll the amount that he had on that?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know G. A. Payette, contracting painter in Sorel?—A. I can't say that I know him personally.

Q. You did not meet him in the course of the month of July last?—A. Payette?

Q. Yes. Let me see, perhaps I am making a mistake. (After referring to notes.) No, G. A. Payette, of Sorel, Contracting or Decorating Painter. Did you see him in the course of the month of July last and did he complain to you about the painters being at work from the Department at Lanctot's house?—A. Payette? It is possible.

Q. Do you remember if he did or not?—A. Well, sometimes there are complaints that our men go out and do work.

Q. Yes.—A. You see, and then come back and get their job again with us. Very often complaints have been made of that sort: people complaining that some of our men will leave their job with us, go out in Sorel, take work for a certain time and come back to our work after that.

Q. Yes?—A. Well, that is the source of complaint.

Q. Do you remember Mr. Payette meeting you at the end of July, 1910, and complaining to you that men employed—actually employed in the department—were working on Lanctot's house, and that you told him you would put a stop to it.—A. I didn't understand it that way.

Q. You didn't understand it that way? Then did he report to you about a fortnight or so afterwards and tell you that no stop had been put to it, that the men continued working for Lanctot, and you told him that your orders had not been obeyed?—A. I don't recollect that.

By the Chairman:

Q. If he had spoken to you in that particular way you say you didn't so understand it?—A. I would have understood that some of our men had left their work, you see, to go elsewhere and taken the work off the hands of the local men.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Who were not actually employed by the department?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember telling him?—A. I had complaints of that sort.

Q. That if they were working on Lanctot's house you knew nothing about it?—A. I beg your pardon.

Q. Do you remember telling him in July last, towards the end of July, that if men were working on Lanctot's house, men from the department, you knew nothing about it?—A. I don't remember the conversation we had.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. You know that man Payette?—A. Well, I know the name, I have seen him once or twice.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is the man here?

MR. MCDUGALL—Yes, he is here.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. I find among your cheque stubbs, Mr. Papineau, the stubb of a cheque dated November 18, 1910, in favour of Henry Proulx for three days at \$1.80, \$5.40. 'Ship-yard pay roll, 1st to 15th November, refd.'—A. Yes.

Q. Can you, by examining the pay roll, tell us what this payment to Henry Proulx was?—A. It must have been a balance, it must have been a payment in advance, as Proulx was leaving. He had been paid for the fortnight previous and there was a balance of \$3 that would have been due to him at the end of the month you see. So we gave him a cheque and he gave his receipt.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. What is the date of that cheque?—A. It is dated November 18.

Q. For what amount?—A. \$5.40.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. And the word 'refd.' means 'refund.'—A. Yes, 'refund.' That means that the paymaster got the receipt of Proulx, you see. At the time we gave that cheque to Proulx he signed a receipt. The receipt goes to the paymaster, and the paymaster instead of paying the money to Proulx you see, hands it back and it is re-deposited to our credit.

MR. MCDUGALL.—All right, I have nothing more to ask.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Mr. Papineau, you say you were in Montreal on the 29th May.—A. On the 30th of May and I think I was there the day before.

Q. You recollect that was a Sunday?—A. Yes, it was Sunday, and I believe I was there the day before.

Q. So you were absent from Sorel on the 29th of May?—A. I think so.

Q. What time did you leave on the 29th of May?

MR. MCDUGALL.—He has not said the 29th.

MR. LAFLAMME.—He says so now. He says he left the day before.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. What time did you leave on the 29th, Mr. Papineau?—A. I could have left either on Friday at four or at 3.25 I think, or else Saturday morning.

Q. What time in the morning?—A. The train leaves at 7.30.

Q. So there is no doubt about it, Mr. Papineau, that on the 29th of May from 7.30 in the forenoon until the 30th of May in the evening you were away from Sorel?—A. As far as I can recollect I was.

Q. Of course if you were away on the 29th of May you cannot swear whether or not your assistant, Mr. Terrault, was present in Sorel?—A. No.

Q. He might have been absent also?—A. He might.

Q. Who would attend to the ship yard then in the absence of both of you?—A. Well, for pressing orders they would go to the different foremen or the timekeeper.

Q. So that it would not be out of the ordinary that a person might apply to Mr. Champagne or Mr. Page in case both the director and his assistant were absent?—A. Well, possibly.

Q. When does navigation close? When did it close in 1910?—A. Well, about the 25th of November.

Q. From what date?—A. About the 25th of November.

Q. So that the week of the 22nd November would be a very busy one?—A. Yes.

Q. In what respect?—A. Well, all vessels turn in and give their reports; talk about what they have done in the season, give a report of what they want to be done to their vessels in the way of repairs, and so on.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. There would be ships coming into the river for the winter?—A. Yes, the dredges and tugs coming back from the work.

Q. Crews are discharged?—A. Crews are discharged.

Q. And paid?—A. And paid.

Q. Reports are made?—A. Yes.

Q. And so on? So that the week in which navigation closes is the most busy week that you have at the ship yard?—A. Yes, and when they go out in the spring.

Q. The opening and the closing of navigation?—A. Yes.

Q. Would that not be an additional reason why you didn't acknowledge the receipt of the cheque of the 21st November until 2nd December?—A. Yes, that would certainly cause—might cause a delay in answering the letter.

Q. Well now, you did not notice when you got this cheque of Mr. Lanctot's that it was made out payable to the order of the Department of Marine and Fisheries?—A. Well, I didn't make—I suppose I didn't pay particular attention to that.

The CHAIRMAN.—He has already said it was endorsed.

Mr. LAFLAMME.—I want to show that was by oversight, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is what he has already said, Mr. Laflamme. Here you are (handing cheque to Counsel).

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. You say you didn't notice it at first?—A. That it was made payable to the Department?

Q. Yes.—A. Well, I did not pay any particular attention. I signed it in the usual way I endorse cheques.

Q. Well, the fact that you in the first place endorsed it L. G. Papineau and got it endorsed by Mr. Baril would indicate that you didn't notice that the payee was the Department of Marine and Fisheries?—A. It simply shows that at the moment of endorsing I did not have my attention turned to that point.

Q. Now do you remember when you sent the cheque first to the deposit of Papineau and Baril, how long after the 2nd of December?—A. I believe it was—we had prepared several refunds in that way and I think we sent all of them at the end of the month, on the 29th.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. You sent your refunds at the end of the month?—A. I sent several refunds you see, because we have a few. (Referring to documents). You see we have one refund there of the 27th December. We have another of the 29th you see. We have another of the 29th again. We have another of the 29th again. Another here, 29th of December. Then the refund No. 10 is dated—it is the same date you see, so I expect it was turned in along with the other refunds.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. On the 29th?—A. On the 29th.

Q. Very well. Now will you give us the reasons why you held these cheques until the latter part of the month for refund? You make a refund to the department?—A. Every deposit, yes. That was the date of the deposit.

Q. In the bank?—A. The bank.

Q. Will you explain why you will hold a cheque for some time until the end of the month for refund?—A. Well, it is more a matter of habit than anything else, I suppose.

Q. Well, is it a habit?—A. Yes, as a rule we make them once a month.

Q. Once a month, and you will make them at the end of the month?—A. Well, there is no particular date for it.

Q. No particular date for it? Now, when did the cheque return from the bank

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

for proper endorsation?—A. I think I got it—I must have got it I suppose, after the recess. We were stopped for ten days you see. We closed——

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. When was it?—A. We closed on the Thursday, the last Thursday in December until the 10th of January.

Q. Oh, I see?—A. The shops were closed for putting things in order, repairs and cleaning the boilers and engines and things like that. Then we started work again on the Monday after the Epiphany. That was the 10th, I think, of January, or the 11th.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. It was then that you got this cheque from the bank?—A. I think so.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. You said you closed on Thursday before the first of January?—A. Yes, Thursday evening.

Q. Then the Thursday in that case would have been the 29th of December, because the 1st day of January, 1911, was on Sunday?—A. 1911, yes.

Q. So on the 29th you deposited your money and closed the shops. On what day did you reopen the shops?—A. On the 10th. The 10th must be the second Monday in January.

Q. No, the 10th would be the second Tuesday?—A. Tuesday.

Q. Yes. The 9th would be the second Monday?—A. Well, it was the 9th.

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. Perhaps Monday was a holiday?—A. No, the 6th.

By Mr. Barker:

Q. Mr. Papineau, you are the officer in charge of the yards at Sorel, Chief Director?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The first you heard about this matter, as I understand you, was about the 21st or 22nd of November, 1910, when Mr. Champagne spoke to you?—A. Yes.

Q. He asked you if you had heard from Lanctot?—A. Yes.

Q. You wanted to know why, and he said what?—A. He said 'because you are likely to have a letter from Mr. Lanctot because we have sent him an account.'

Q. Then a letter from Mr. Lanctot did come immediately after Champagne spoke to you?—A. Yes, within a couple of days.

Q. When you got that letter and the account and the cheque you did not act upon them immediately?—A. No, not exactly.

Q. Why?—A. Because I wanted to have time to look over it.

Q. Only that?—A. Well, I am sometimes serious enough.

Q. Did you think it was your duty to make investigation or inquiry as to the correctness of this?—A. Well, that is what I said.

Q. That is what you meant?—A. I said so before. That I had——

Q. Never mind what you said before. I am asking you now: you wanted to look into it?—A. Yes.

Q. It was an irregular proceeding, wasn't it?—A. That is a matter of opinion.

Q. I ask you, wasn't it irregular the doing of this thing, or was it regular?—I do not care which way you put it?—A. It is an exception, yes.

Q. An exception?—A. It is exceptional.

Q. You would not consider it irregular for you, as director of that establishment, to supply labour for Lanctot's and pay for the labour for a gentleman, whether he was a Member of Parliament or not, a person in no way connected with the Government—you would not consider that irregular?

APPENDIX No. 3

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU objected to the question, stating that the witness was not on trial, and that the investigation had only reference to the regularity of Mr. Lanctot's proceeding.

Mr. BARKER: I want to ascertain if he made an investigation, and if not why not.

The CHAIRMAN: He said so.

WITNESS: I said so before.

By Mr. Barker:

Q. Tell me what the investigation was you made?—A. I said so before.

Q. What was the investigation as to the correctness of this proceeding?—A. I went to the man with the account and asked him to check his time and see that it was correct.

Q. That was Champagne, was it?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you yourself check the time charged from June to November to see whether they were charging all that Mr. Lanctot ought to have paid?—A. No, I did not check that myself.

Q. Did you tell anybody to do so?—A. Well, the two men concerned, Pagé and Champagne, went over the figures.

Q. Did you tell them to do so?—A. Yes.

Q. You did?—A. I asked them to see that the account was correct.

Q. In what respect. It was in the account made out by Champagne?—A. The account must be correct with respect to time.

Q. You had before you in a letter Champagne's own account of this work?—A. Yes.

Q. What object had you in asking him to check his own account?—A. Well, it is my duty to be sure that a thing like that is correct when it goes to the Department.

Q. I think you got that account made out by him running over several months?

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU.—He did not say he got it made by him.

By Mr. Barker:

Q. The account supposed to have been made up by Champagne?—A. Would you rather have me send an account like that without looking into it at all.

Q. I do not think you did look at it, that is the reason I am asking. You had in that letter from Mr. Lanctot an account for \$375 or something of that kind. You simply asked Mr. Champagne to look into it?—A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Pagé?—A. Yes.

Q. You did not yourself?—A. No.

Q. I think it was the account sent in by these men to Mr. Lanctot. As Chief of the Department you made no inquiry or investigation?—A. That is what Mr. Barker says.

Q. You have assented?

Mr. DEVLIN (Wright).—He has not.

WITNESS.—I hear what you say. What is it?

By Mr. Barker:

Q. Did you, beyond asking Champagne or Page, to look into that account and see if it was correct, make an inquiry yourself?—A. There was no other means of knowing.

Q. I did not ask you that?

Mr. DEVLIN.—I appeal for the protection of the witness.

The CHAIRMAN.—He has said several times that the inquiry he made was for Page and Champagne to go over the account.

Mr. BARKER.—I want to ask whether he himself made an inquiry.

HON. JACQUES BUREAU.—He says he did, and asked the men to do it.

By Mr. Barker:

Q. Did you make any inquiry yourself beyond asking Page or Champagne?—A. There was no other means of finding out.

Q. And, therefore, I suppose you did not do it? Now, Mr. Douaire was a witness here. I want to ask you about Mr. Albert Douaire. He is charged in this account for his work, or Mr. Lanctot is charged for fifteen days?—A. Yes.

Q. Douaire says he worked eight weeks. Were you here when he said that?—A. No, sir. I was not here.

Q. Well, that is in this testimony. He says he worked eight weeks. How many days would that mean?—A. Eight weeks.

Q. Eight weeks?—A. Deduct Sundays and holidays and you will find out.

Q. What would it be? Six days a week would be forty-eight days?—A. That is arithmetic, yes.

Q. Do they work six days? You understand, sir, what I mean. How many days do the men usually work in the week?—A. If they do not get on a drunk they work six days.

Q. He means then when he says he worked eight weeks, that he worked forty-eight days?—A. I am not Douaire, I do not know what he means.

Q. There are only charged by the government for that man's work fifteen days. That would mean thirty-three days uncharged at \$2 a day; that would be \$66 apparently charged for that man. Have you made any inquiry recently as to that fact?—A. Recently?

Q. Recently?—A. No.

Q. Have you directed any inquiry to be made?—A. No.

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. As director of the Sorel ship yard, did you verify the correctness of the account produced before you in connection with Lanctot's house?—A. I was satisfied that the account was correct.

Q. And you verified them in the usual way that accounts are verified in connection with the administration of the ship yard at Sorel?—A. Yes, it was the usual manner.

By Mr. Doherty:

Q. I understood you to say, in answer to Mr. Laflamme that if you were absent and Mr. Terreault was absent, people on matters of pressing business might address themselves to Mr. Champagne?—A. Yes.

Q. Do I understand from that that in your absence, or whether you were absent or not, Mr. Champagne was in a position to agree with people to hire out the men of the department and to furnish the material?—A. No, I did not mean that.

Q. I understand he would not have any authority of that kind?—A. In a very pressing thing he might let a man go out and do certain work for perhaps a day or so.

Q. But to agree to furnish people to paint a house?—A. No, he had no authority like that.

Q. If you had been present yourself, and an application had been made to you to enter into an agreement to furnish painters and materials for the painting of a house, would you have agreed to do it on behalf of the department?

HON. JACQUES BUREAU.—That is not a fair question to put. This man is not on trial.

MR. DOHERTY.—I submit my question.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I think the witness may answer the question.

APPENDIX No. 3

By Mr. Doherty:

Q. Will you be good enough to answer the question?—A. Try Sorel and I will let you know.

Q. I want an answer here in Ottawa?—A. I would require to have good reasons to do it.

Q. Will you indicate what you would understand by good reasons?—A. Well, cases of urgency or cases of necessity, things like that. In the ordinary course of things I would not do it.

Q. In the ordinary course of things you would not do it?—A. I would not do it.

Q. And I think no subordinate of yours would have the right to do what you consider you would not have a right to do yourself?—A. Exactly.

Q. Now, I understood as to these dates, that the way you fixed them was that you were in Montreal on the last Sunday in May on the occasion of the Dollard Monument celebration. The way you fixed the Saturday was that it was the day preceding that?—A. Yes.

Q. So that if last year the Sunday was the 29th May, then you were not absent from Sorel on the Monday and Tuesday following. It would be the 28th and 29th, the 29th being Sunday, that you were absent?—A. I did not mean the day after.

Q. No, the day before?—A. The day before.

Q. In saying that you were away on the 29th, it was on the basis that Sunday was the 30th?—A. I recollect having been in Montreal on the occasion of that celebration or that demonstration.

Q. That was on Sunday?—A. On a Sunday.

Q. And you were in Montreal on the day before?—A. The day before.

Q. So, whether you were absent on the 29th or not depends on whether the Sunday was on the 30th?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is self-evident.

Witness retired.

3 o'clock, p.m.

AUGUSTIN PAYETTE, sworn.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Payette?—A. At Sorel.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Ornamental painter.

Q. How old are you?—A. Thirty years old.

Q. How long have you worked as ornamental painter?—A. Twelve years.

Q. In 1908 you were employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Sorel?—A. In 1908, yes, sir, I was.

Q. About the month of October 1908, were you sent to do some painting at Mr. Lanctot's, when he was living in some premises he had rented on Roy Street?—A. I do not remember which month it was or which date but I know perfectly well that I went there to do some papering, one day or two, I think, only papering; but I do not remember who paid me; I do not know if Mr. Lanctot paid me; I am not positive it was not Mr. Lanctot. It must have been Mr. Pagé or the Government. I cannot swear as to that.

Q. Who sent you to work there?—A. Mr. Pagé.

Q. Do you mean Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé?—A. Jean-Baptiste Pagé, yes.

Q. The foreman of the painters for the government?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you working under him?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Alfred Douaire, painter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you went to work at Mr. Lanctot's house on Roy Street, did you see Mr. Douaire?—A. When I went in the house to do the papering, Mr. Alfred Douaire was leaving, in the afternoon; he was leaving to go back to the government; he had finished the painting.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Now, let us come to the year 1910. Do you know, Mr. Payette, the residence belonging to Mr. Lanctot on George street and which was painted by him that same year?—A. Yes, sir, I know it very well.

Q. Have you seen employees of the government working at the painting of that house?—A. Yes, sir, I saw employees of the government working there.

Q. Did you see, amongst them, in the month of July or August, Mr. Alfred Douaire, we spoke of a moment ago, working at Mr. Adelard Lanctot's house on George street.

The WITNESS.—In July or August?

The COUNSEL. Yes.—A. I cannot tell if he has worked there all the time, but I saw Mr. Douaire working there in the month of July or August.

Q. I am not asking you if he worked there during the whole month of July or the whole month of August but in the course of these two months have you seen him working at the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir, I was working past the church and I passed there every day and I could see Mr. Douaire there.

Q. How far is the church you were working at from Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. The church is a few acres further than Mr. Lanctot's, but the same street.

Q. You saw Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, I saw it.

Q. That house is well painted?—A. Oh, yes, from what I have seen outside, always—and I went inside once.

Q. In the month of May and in June, and also in July, you were a painter-decorator in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you then in the employ of the government?—A. In 1910.

Q. Yes.—A. No, sir.

Q. Before Mr. Lanctot got his house painted, were you in a position to take up the contract of the painting of that house?—A. Yes, the job could have been done. That was in the beginning of spring, and times were dull.

Q. Did you ask Mr. Lanctot to give you the job of the painting of his house on George street?—A. In March, I think, I had occasion to meet Mr. Lanctot, one night, about nine o'clock. He was going in the direction of the Richelieu Hotel. I told him: 'You won't forget me for the painting.' He went on, walking, and he told me: 'I will think it over.'

Q. You were then in a position to take up the job as soon as the house would have been ready?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. After that, did Mr. Lanctot ask you to do the painting of his house?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did he ever mention that afterwards to you?—A. No, never.

Q. When he began to get his house painted, did you again offer your services to him; did you ask him once more to give you the job of his house?—A. I went there, but the men were working at the plastering. I asked them who had the job, and they told me: 'It must be the government people.' That is all they answered me.

Q. Who were the men you saw working at the painting of the house? Can you name them?—A. I don't think I can remember them all, but I can name several of them. I remember having seen Adelard Aly.

Q. And who, besides?—A. Mr. Douaire, Mr. Edmond Brault, Mr. Pagé.

Q. Omer or Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. Omer, I don't remember the names of the others.

Q. Now, you have seen Mr. Lanctot's house. What value do you put on the paint-work which has been done there, material and labour, all included?—A. It is very hard to guess that. Generally, in figuring up a house for a contract, you must see the house or see the place. I only went once in Mr. Lanctot's house, and I didn't go everywhere. I don't know how many rooms there are. The outside, I have seen it while passing. I don't know the size, nothing.

Q. Did you see, judging by the outside, what had been done?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. What kind of a house is it? Is it a brick or a frame house?—A. A frame house.

Q. Clapboarded on the outside?—A. Clapboarded, yes.

Q. Judging from your experience as a painter, how much would it be worth for the contract of painting Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. For the outside, as far as I can see, without knowing the size, but my having painted other houses about the same—Mr. Lanctot's house is very well painted on the outside—I estimate the outside, for the material and labour, the time of the men, at two hundred dollars?

Q. For which part of the work?—A. The outside.

Q. Two hundred dollars, only for the outside?—A. For the outside.

Q. And what about the inside-work?—A. Generally, the inside, that is polishing work. From what I have been able to see, its polishing which has been done in the inside. On the walls, it's plain painting. There are several sorts of polishing, from fine to coarse. Generally, we figure by the yard, and the polishing is figured at a dollar a yard for pretty good work—not the best—material and time included.

Q. Admitting as true that the inside work for polishing has been well done, what value would you put for the total price?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question as being useless, because witness has declared that he had not sufficient information to allow him to form an opinion on the value of the work.

Question is allowed.

Q. Supposing that the inside polishing had been well done, how much would you charge for the job?—A. It is very hard to figure that way. I only saw all that a moment, by the way. If there are many rooms the polishing is a much longer work, if there are many doors. I cannot figure that exactly, but it must be about six hundred dollars for a job like that.

Q. Do you say six hundred dollars for the whole or six hundred dollars for the inside?—A. Six hundred dollars for the inside. But if there are many doors, it is more expensive; if the doors are not many, it is less expensive.

Q. Do you say that you could have taken the contract for eight hundred dollars?—A. Without having seen the place, yes, I would have taken the contract for eight hundred dollars.

Q. And in that amount, how much would you put for the material, the oil, the paint, &c., and how much for the labour?—A. For inside work, materials are pretty expensive, and the labour is also expensive. Polishing is much longer. The material, for the inside, I estimate about two hundred or two hundred and fifty dollars, and the rest is for the labour.

Q. Now, how much would you put for the paint and the other materials for outside work?—A. For the outside, the material might come to about seventy-five or eighty dollars.

Q. Will you take communication of Exhibits Nos. 13 and 30, which are now shown you?

(Witness takes communication of the two exhibits.)

Q. You have taken communication of them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. After having taken communication of Exhibits Nos. 13 and 20, and having seen the quantity of painting, of oil and other materials entered in those accounts to the amount of \$81.60, do you say that it was sufficient for the painting of Mr. Adelard Lanctot's house?—A. Does that cover all the paint which has got into Mr. Lanctot's house?

Q. If it is all?—A. It could not be sufficient.

Q. You don't believe it to be sufficient?—A. No, sir.

Q. Take a look at Exhibit No. 15, which is an account of Cyrille Labelle & Co., and beginning with item of May 24, 1910, as far as the end, and adding those items which you see entered in this account to the \$81.60 carried to the other exhibit, do you

say then that there was a sufficient quantity of paint and other material for the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. No, there was not enough.

Mr. Geoffrion, M.P., makes the observation that the above evidence seems to him useless, as witness has already declared that he does not know the size of the house, the number of rooms or the size of those rooms, and that the committee is uselessly losing time in seeking to elicit information from the witness about the value to be put on that work.

The Chairman says that, considering that witness has already declared that he does not know the size of the house, nor in what way the work has been done, it seems to him that his estimation has absolutely no value, and that in fact it is a loss of time for the committee to question witness upon the value of that work.

Q. Among the materials required for the painting, you don't include the nails, nor the iron, or nothing of that kind?—A. No, sir, only the painting.

Q. You would not include the nails, nor the iron, or anything of the kind with the painting?—A. No.

Cross-examined by Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. How long have you worked at paper-hanging, in the house on Roy street?—

A. I am not sure, about a day or a day and a half.

Q. You know nothing about the arrangements entered into about that work by Mr. Pagé and Mr. Lanctot?—A. No, I don't remember.

Q. Now, how can you be so sure about the person who has paid you for that work, either Mr. Lanctot, Mr. Pagé or the department?—A. It is because, during those intervals, I often worked, at evenings or in the afternoon, for Mr. Pagé; I used to do some paper-hanging, or something like that. He sent me to Mr. Lanctot to do some ceiling work and some paper-hanging. Mr. Pagé was often paying me for outside work, and I don't remember if it was him who has paid me or the government.

Q. How much have you received for that work?—A. I don't remember. I don't know if the paper-hanging was by the roll or by day.

Q. You say that when you arrived at Mr. Lanctot's house, on King street, Mr. Douaire had got through with the painting?—A. Mr. Douaire was going from there, he had done the paint-work.

Q. But you have not seen him at all at work at his painting?—A. No, not at all. Mr. Douaire was just leaving with his brushes and his things.

Q. What makes you remember that in July, 1910, you saw Douaire working at the house on George street?—A. I was working a little farther than the church, at Mr. Cournouiller, and I was passing there three times a day.

Q. At what date did you begin working at Mr. Cournouiller?—A. I cannot remember—about the middle of July, I suppose.

Q. In what way do you remember having begun to work at Mr. Cournouiller in the middle of July?—A. In what way.

Q. Yes, what makes you remember that?—A. I have men who have worked, and I remember that the men have worked in the month of July.

Q. What makes you remember that they have worked there on the fifteenth of July?—A. I don't know what you mean by that, what makes me remember, you say?

Q. To the best of your knowledge?—A. I know that in July I have worked at Mr. Cournouiller.

Q. I know, but what makes you remember that it was July rather than in August?—A. I have worked in August and in July.

Q. What makes you remember that, that it is in July and not in another month?—A. It is very hard to say, what makes me remember it.

Q. Now, how many times have you seen Mr. Douaire at Mr. Lanctot's house doing some paint-work, during the month of July, 1910?—A. I cannot tell the number of days. I used to pass that way, and Mr. Douaire saluted me.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. You don't remember neither how many times you have seen him in August?
—A. No.

Q. Do you know when the woodwork was finished at the house?—A. Mr. Lanctot's house?

Q. Yes?—A. I cannot say. I know that the painters have worked outside, but I cannot say at what time.

Q. Do you remember when the house was ready to be painted?—A. When Mr. Lanctot's house was ready?

Q. Yes?—A. About the middle of June, I think. I am not sure of that.

Q. You are not sure?—A. I took no notice of that. When I saw that I could not get the painting, I dropped the matter.

Q. You did not renew your application for that work, because you had some other work to do?—A. Extra work can always be taken.

Q. For instance, you had work at Mr. Brunet?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you worked for Mr. Brunet?—A. I think I have three men who have worked there during three weeks, I suppose.

Q. And after that you got another job for Mr. Falardeau?—A. After Mr. Brunet, yes, three men have worked at Mr. Falardeau, during a week, I think.

Q. After that, you took a job for Mr. Amable Lussier?—A. No, sir, I took no job for Mr. Lussier.

Q. You are sure?—A. —

Q. Did Mr. Lussier ask you to do some work for him?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. About what time?—A. I do not remember that.

Q. In the course of the summer?—A. In the course of the summer.

Q. What is he doing, this Mr. Amable Lussier. What is his occupation?—A. He keeps a store.

Q. A big store?—A. Yes.

Q. Is he a good payer?—A. I rather think so. I never worked for him.

Q. Then why did you not agree to do some work for him?—A. Why I did not agree to do work for Mr. Lussier? The house he had was an old house, and it was to do some paperhanging, and at that time I had no men to do that kind of work.

Q. Is it not true that you agreed to do it in the first place and that afterwards you delayed until he gave up the idea of giving you the job?—A. I called upon Mr. Lussier and told him I had no men to do paperhanging and that if he could find other people to do the work he might take them.

Q. Did not Mr. Falardeau also complain of the quality of the work?—A. No, sir, not much.

Q. And he told you so?—A. Yes, he told me so.

Q. He was wrong; your work was well done?—A. The work was well done; but he wanted us to get through very quick, and we could not hurry the work as much as that.

Q. The consequence was he was obliged to have the work done over by others?—A. He had it done twice after that.

Q. By whom?—A. By Mr. Busteed, of the Richelieu company. Then he still considered that it was not well done and he had it done over again by the men of Mr. Arcand, of Montreal.

Q. He was hard to please?—A. It looks like that. Pretty hard to please. I do not know whether he is whimsical or not.

Q. You were also unlucky with the job you did for Mr. Falardeau?—A. Mr. Falardeau thought we were charging too high; he had painters from the government. He went and got them.

Q. How much per day did you charge Mr. Falardeau?—A. I do not remember how much I charged him on these occasions. I usually charge \$2.50 a day and \$2 or \$2.25 for the men.

Q. Two dollars and a half for yourself?—A. Yes.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Did not Mr. Falardeau also complain of the quality of the work?—A. No, sir, he complained of the men who were not quick enough.

Q. As a painter, what would you do in order to establish the price of your bid before accepting a job of painting?—A. What would I do if——?

Q. Before fixing the price of your tender?—A. I would try and see the work, to see how big a job it was.

Q. Explain that in a few words, Mr. Payette; what means would you take?—A. In the first place, I would ask the owner about what quality of paint he wanted to have.

Q. Then?—A. Then, for the inside, I would figure that by the yard. I generally figure by the yard for such work. I would find out the number of yards and charge so much per yard.

Q. And for the outside you would take the size of the house?—A. Certainly.

Q. In order to have an idea of the quality and quantity of paint required for the job?—A. Certainly. See the work there is to be done, the men's time and the materials.

Q. Now, unless he proceeds in that manner, a contractor would be foolish to try and form an idea of the value of a job unless he had that information?—A. It is always possible to form an idea of the work by comparing with other houses which one has painted. In the course of twelve years a man has time to paint several houses, and to paint all kinds of houses. A man can always make a rough guess. It often happens that a man does not take the trouble to measure all the rooms. Measures are taken to find out the number of yards,

Q. Will you take cognizance of this account, dated August 20, 1910, between Mr. Lanctot and Mr. Joseph Rivet, and tell us whether, by adding the quantity of materials charged in this account to the quantity furnished by the department, and to that charged in Mr. Labelle's account, you would consider that these quantities put together would be sufficient for the work done at Mr. Lanctot's house?

Mr. Lafamme withdraws his question.

Q. You know nothing of the quality of the paint that has been used there?—A. Yes, I know the quality of the paint. I often saw the painters going by with the paint. Mr. Paul, a fellow well known to me. I saw the mixed paint that he was carrying, especially the yellow paint. It was paint of first quality.

Q. When you take a job of painting at a fixed price and you furnish the materials and the work, how much profit do you calculate to make? How much per cent?—A. It depends. When the men work hard we make more money; when paint can be bought cheap. Usually when I take a job, it is three coats of paint; an ordinary house, to scrape the wood and put putty in is worth 20 cents a yard. Then there is graining, and graining may be done at 60 cents a yard. It all depends.

Q. You have not answered my question. How much per cent profit do you calculate on a contract, when you find the materials and the work in Sorel?—A. What profit do I calculate?

Q. Yes.—A. I do not understand very well what you mean?

Q. You have been in that business for twelve years, you ought to know. When you take a contract, you expect to realize a profit?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the average profit that you realize in Sorel when you furnish the work and the paint?—A. Sometimes profits are good. Sometimes they are very poor.

Q. On an average?—A. On an average, from 20 to 25 per cent.

Q. When you buy paint wholesale, you also realize a profit on that?—A. Yes, a profit.

Q. How much?—A. We realize very little. At Mr. Labelle's they sell us that—about two or three cents per hundred; white lead, oil, about the same thing.

Q. You do not buy your paint wholesale, do you?—A. No, sir.

Q. The estimate you gave is based upon the supposition that you would buy the

APPENDIX No. 3

paint at retail price?—A. Yes, yes. At Mr. Labelle's the painters buy paint cheaper than anywhere else.

Q. Retail?—A. Retail.

Q. Supposing that house had been yours, Mr. Payette, and that you had done the work, for yourself, the painting, both inside and outside, are you prepared to swear that it would have cost you more than \$457?—A. As to the inside of the house, I cannot see how much it may have cost, as I said a while ago. I only saw a little of it, downstairs.

Q. You have given a rough estimate of the value of the inside work when you answered my learned friend, Mr. McDougall?—A. I told him I had not seen that, from the houses, and from what I may surmise, the number of rooms there may be—the doors also.

Q. Is it not true Mr. Payette, that if that house had been yours, you might have done that work for \$457?—A. Only the work?

Q. The work and the paint?—A.

Q. Think of it, when a man is working for himself he always works cheaper?—A. Yes. Not with the inside work.

Q. You know what there is inside?—A. If it is all like what I have seen.

Q. You have not seen the inside work, you only saw the outside?—A. I saw the inside. Not the whole, only part of it. I saw the polishing.

Q. Did any one ask you to make the estimate you are giving here to-day?—A. Yes, Mr. Thibaudeau met me two or three weeks ago, I think, and he asked me if I could estimate that house.

Q. What was your answer?—A. I answered him that I could not estimate that, because I had only seen a small part of the inside and the outside. I did not know the size, nor nothing.

Q. And you are not in a better position to-day?—A. I am not in a better position.

Q. You are not in a better position to-day to make this estimate than you were at that time, when Mr. Thibaudeau asked you to do it?—A. As to the inside, I cannot estimate that.

Re-examined by Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. When you speak of polishing, what is used to make the polishing?—A. The polishing that was done at Mr. Lanctot's, I believe that..... at first they dyed the wood and then they put a coat of shellack.

Q. Is pumice stone used? Is steel wire used? Is sand paper used, or any such thing?—A. Yes, these things are used, pumice stone and steel wire, that is steel wire and pumice stone, both are used; and then sand paper, for the first polishing.

Q. In the account for \$81.60, do you see any of these items?—A. In the account of the government?

Q. Yes.—A. No.

Q. In Sorel, what is the price charged generally for painters, with respect to their wages?—A. I charge two dollars and a half per day, the men are two dollars.

Q. Generally in Sorel, what is the price?—A. A. Two dollars usually, not a man for polishing, an ordinary man.

Q. And men for polishing?—A. Two dollars and a half.

Q. After examining this account, will you tell us if this account is not very low?—A. It is not very very high.

Q. You spoke to us in your cross-examination of work done for Mr. Pagé in the evening. When you worked in 1908 at the house rented from Mr. Lanctot, was that day or night work?—A. At Mr. Lanctot's, that was in the day time, but often I used to work for Mr. Pagé in the evening.

Q. But not at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. No, no.

Witness discharged.

JEAN BAPTISTE PAGÉ, sworn.

Examined by Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. You live in Sorel, Mr. Pagé?—A. I do.

Q. You are in the employ of the Marine and Fisheries Department?—A. I am.

Q. What is your occupation there?—A. I am a painter, sir.

Q. Are you a foreman or simply a painter?—A. A foreman.

Q. At what place in Sorel do you work for the department?—A. At St. Joseph de Sorel.

Q. Take communication of Exhibit '2' and say if you know any of the men whose names are written in that exhibit?—A. I do.

Q. Do you know all these men?—A. I do.

Q. Do you know who prepared that account, Exhibit No. 2?—A. That account was prepared by me.

Q. Is it in your handwriting?—A. It is very much like mine.

Q. Did you prepare an account like this one or a duplicate of that one?—A. I prepared one account.

Q. Did you, perchance, give it to Mr. Lanctot, the member?—A. I gave it to Mr. Champagne.

Q. Who is this Mr. Champagne?—A. He is the timekeeper in Sorel; it is he who keeps the time.

Q. What is his first name?—A. Oscar Champagne.

Q. If you have prepared this account, or an account similar to this one, which you gave to Mr. Champagne, Oscar, where did you take the particulars to make the account?—A. I took the particulars from the account I had kept myself.

Q. From a book?—A. From a book and a time sheet.

Q. Where is the book and where are the time sheets?—A. The time sheets I gave them to Mr. Champagne.

Q. And the book?—A. I have it here; it is a book which I kept for myself.

Q. What is the name of that book?—A. It is a little pocket-book that I was keeping for myself.

Q. Was it for the service of the government?—A. It was for my own justification, don't you know. To have the detail of the time I was putting in, to have the copy.

Q. You are not the timekeeper, nor the one who keeps the time of the men?—A. I keep the time of the men, of the painters for my department.

Q. Oscar Champagne, what does he do?—A. Oscar Champagne takes the time which is given him, from each department.

Q. You kept the sheets at the same time as you kept your book?—A. I gave the sheets, and this is the same time as the sheets which I have given away.

Q. Why did you not give away the book also?—A. Because I have not been asked for it.

Q. And in that book that you are now showing us, what is entered?—A. There are certain small things for myself.

Q. Is there any time for Mr. Lanctot's house in that book?—A. This is the time which I kept for. . . . Yes, yes, that is the time.

Q. That book contains certain particulars of the work, of the men at Mr. Adéard Lanctot's house for the month of June to the month of November?—A. Yes, sir, it is the same time.

Q. You began here, to make entries for the paint work of Mr. Lanctot, in 1910, in the month of June? In your book, in the printed part, for instance, I find the words: June, Friday, the 30th. Is that the place where you began the account of Mr. Lanctot? Is that the first entry on the first page?—A. It is.

Q. Before that, what is there entered in your book? These are details about something else?—A. They are details about something else.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Is the last entry for the time of the men who worked at Mr. Lanctot's, dated the 21st of November, 1910, and is it on the page which is headed in print: July, Tuesday the 18th?—A. The heading, I never went by the heading of the pages.

Q. The last entry is of the month of November, is it not?—A. It is.

Q. Now, all the entries in that book are made consecutively, from the month of June to the month of November?—A. From the month of June, all the entries which have been made were made for Mr. Lanctot.

Q. But there are entries made after those in that book, which are about other things before the month of November?—A. That is a memorandum, sir——

Q. I am not asking you for details. Please look after the month of November and before the month of November, if there are not entries made in that book for transactions made before the month of November?—A. I see none, sir.

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to the filing of that memorandum book, inasmuch as the witness has already stated—as it appears in the book itself—that that book contains entries relating to matters which have no connection with the object of this investigation.

The CHAIRMAN.—I hold that the parts of the book which relate to the work done at Lanctot's house can be put in, but only those parts. The rest is a sealed book, the part put in begins on the page dated Friday, June the 30th, and it terminates on the page dated Tuesday, July the 18th.

The book in question is filed as exhibit 23.

Q. The book is now marked with your signature on each page, from the month of June until the month of November?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you use that book beyond the folios which are marked by your signature in red, for other matters?—A. I used it for myself, for my own business.

Q. Is there in that book any entries, beyond the month of November, for your own business which took place before the month of November?—A. Well, I made some entries for paints which I was receiving. Whenever I received paints from the government, I would take copies of the entries to keep them for myself, for my own satisfaction.

Q. Can you show us the entries which relate to paint for the service of the government, and which may have been made in that book after the month of November, but concerning dates prior to the month of November?—A. Not after the month of November, sir.

Q. Look at the book?—A. There is none, sure.

Witness examined the book.

The preceding question is again read to the witness, as follows:—

Q. Can you show us the entries which relate to paint for the service of the government, and which may have been made in that book after the month of November, but concerning dates prior to the month of November? Is there entries for the service of the government?—A. There is some before the month of November.

Q. Where are they, and on which dates?—A. I believe the dates are there.

Q. It is a memorandum which you keep?—A. For myself.

Q. To remember the dates and particulars?—A. Yes, for myself. It was in order to keep a copy.

The Chairman:

Q. Have you made the entries for the work which was done at Mr. Lanctot's, from day to day, or did you do that in one block?—A. Every evening.

Q. How could you know in order to keep the time of these men, that they were working there?—A. I passed there three times a day: morning, noon and evening.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You passed where?—A. At Mr. Lanctot's house.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. In the morning when your men went did you know where they went to work? Did you know whether they went to work at Mr. Lanctot's or at government jobs?—

A. At Mr. Lanctot's.

Q. Did you know that they went there?—A. Yes, yes.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Where are, in this book, the entries for paints and other things belonging to the government, apart from the men's time, and what are the dates of the entries. (The witness shows the page.)

A. This is a copy of the entries for paint received by me from the government.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. What date?—A. July 9, 1910.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. And these entries are at the page in the book under the printed heading: 'February, Wednesday, the 22nd'?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are these paints connected with Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Not at all.

Q. You made these entries on the 9th of July?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is that book? What do you generally use it for?—A. For my own satisfaction.

Q. How does it happen that in that book you made entries on the 9th of July, before the entries of the month of June, with regard to the men's work at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. That is a copy of an order I gave.

Q. That you gave on the 9th of July?—A. No, no. It is the copy I took, to keep that for my own satisfaction.

Q. But you took the copy on the 9th of July?—A. No, sir, I took the copy later on, but I entered it on the same date as I had given the order.

Q. Did you or did you not enter at the date of July 9 this account or this copy which begins with the words '50 lbs. of orange chrome'?—A. No, sir, I entered that in the month of January; because when an order for paint is to be given, I take the copies to see at which date I have given my orders.

Q. You see at the next page of your book, an entry dated the 29th beginning with the items '100 lbs. of royal blue'?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that entry made?—A. It was made a few days after I had given the order, to keep a copy, to the government.

Q. When did you give the order? On November 29?—A. Yes, sir. That is for the government. It is not for myself.

Q. Then there are a number of blank pages, with some entries before coming to the page which relates to the work done at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You made the entries every day, every evening, for the time the men who were working at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If Mr. Lafrenière, for instance, worked to-day, you entered his time in the evening?—A. In the evening.

Q. And so on, all along until the month of November?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you now look at the account, Paint work for Mr. Lanctot, 1910, June?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that the first entry?—A. On the 3rd.

Q. Octave Lafrenière?—A. Yes, sir; one day.

Q. The next item is on the 4th of June? Octave Lafrenière, one day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And on the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 20th, &c.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Going as far as the 23rd of June?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On the next page, we have the month of July?—A. July

Q. Is Octave Lafrenière there?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. On what day?—A. On the 4th of July.

Q. Only on the 4th?—A. He is there on the fourth and then goes on. On the 4th, there is another one on the 5th, it continues.

Q. On the 4th of July you have R. Octave Lafrenière, one day. Here below that there is Omer Pagé, one day, I think. Then, it begins again: Octave Lafrenière, on the 5th. On the same day, Omer Pagé, one day. Then it continues. On the sixth, both the same, each one day. On the seventh and eighth, and so on.

Q. You prepared the account Exhibit 2 from that book?—A. I prepared one. I do not know if it is the one you have in hand.

Q. Well, examine it again and say if that is the account or if it is an account similar or identical which you prepared?—A. This one has been prepared from mine which I gave to Mr. Champagne.

Q. Look at it to see if it is like yours?—A. You ask me if there are the same entries as on mine,

Q. Yes.—A. It is the same thing.

Q. You are the foreman of painters; you are not the foreman of labourers?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you see an entry in this account about four labourers who worked at the house of Mr. Lanctot. Look at the four last names.—A. The labourers are entered there—three labourers are entered up. They do not belong to my gang.

Q. Where are these journeymen carried in your book, Exhibit 23?—A. I have not those names in my book. I have the names of my painters.

Q. Do I understand that you have not in your book Exhibit 23 the names of Pierre Ethier, sr., Adelard Desorey and Adelard Cain?—A. No, sir; I have not that.

Q. If you prepared an account similar to this one or identical with it, where did you take the particulars to make the account as to these four journeymen?—A. I submitted my sheet to Mr. Champagne for all the painters generally.

Q. Then, you have no account?—A. I have nothing with that, sir.

Q. Who is the foreman of the journeymen?—A. Mr. Gendron.

Q. Did you apply to Mr. Gendron to get the particulars in order to make the account?—A. No, sir.

Q. If you only gave Mr. Champagne the particulars for the painters, then who was it who paid for the account, Exhibit No. 2?—A. I wish to be well understood, Mr. McDougall; I prepared my account for the painters which I gave to Mr. Champagne myself; then Mr. Champagne made his copy, and he must have added the names of the journeymen.

Q. As to the painters, who sent them to work at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. It was Mr. Champagne.

Q. Oscar Champagne?—A. Oscar Champagne.

Q. Did he come to you to ask you to set them free from your work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At whose request? Who asked to send men to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I suppose it was Mr. Lanctot.

Mr. LAFLAMME.—Do not suppose anything.

The WITNESS.—Mr. Lanctot had an interview with Mr. Papineau.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Do you know this, sir?—A. I do not know.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Continue your answer?—A. —

Q. You say: 'Mr. Champagne came to ask for men.' Under what circumstances did he go to ask you that?—A. He came to see me at the shop, and he gave me orders to send men to Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. And then?—A. —

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Did you send any?—A. I sent some, yes. After that, whenever he wanted some, I would send some.

Q. Mr. Lanctot, in all this, had he not asked you for the same thing?—A. He had spoken of it to me some time before.

Q. When?—A. I think it was in the course of the month of May.

Q. At what time in the month of May?—A. I think it was about the twentieth.

Q. About the twentieth of May?—A. Yes.

Q. Had Mr. Champagne spoken to you in the month of May of sending men to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Mr. Champagne spoke to me of Mr. Lanctot on the 2nd of June.

Q. That was the first time that Mr. Champagne asked you to send men to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was Mr. Lanctot present?—A. I did not see him, sir.

Q. At what place did Champagne make you that request?—A. At the shop.

Q. At the government's shop?—A. Yes.

Q. Was Mr. Papineau, the director, present?—A. Oh, I do not know if he was there at the time.

Q. On the 2nd of June, did you on that day send men to work at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. The next day, sir.

Q. On the 3rd of June?—A. Yes.

Q. You had not seen Mr. Lanctot between the 20th of May and the 3rd of June about sending men to his house?—A. I saw him once.

Q. For the same purpose?—A. He was coming out of the office, I think. I was going to the office myself and I met him. He asked me if I could let him have some men. I told him, yes, if Mr. Papineau was willing, if he was consenting.

Q. That was a few days before the 3rd of June?—A. Yes, a few days before—

Q. Was it before Mr. Champagne asked you to send some men?—A. Two or three days before—

Q. When you told Mr. Lanctot that you would send men, if Mr. Papineau would consent to you so doing, what did he answer you?—A. Mr. Lanctot told me that he would see Mr. Papineau.

Q. When you sent men, on the 3rd of June, had Mr. Lanctot seen Mr. Papineau?—A. I cannot say.

Q. You did not see Mr. Lanctot after that?—A. No, sir.

Q. When Champagne came to ask you to send men to Lanctot, did he tell you that Papineau had consented to send the men?—A. He did not speak of it to me at all.

Q. Had you yourself spoken to Mr. Papineau; had you asked him if he consented to send men to Mr. Lanctot?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you remember who is the first man you sent to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who is he?—A. Octave Lafrenière.

Q. Does his name appear in your book?—A. It does appear.

Q. When you sent these men to work at Mr. Lanctot's house, did you see that their names were punched?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was the keeper of the punch at your shop?—A. Mr. Cuthbert Champagne.

Q. Whilst these men were working at Mr. Lanctot's house, did you tell Cuthbert Champagne to punch their names, whether they were present or not?—A. Yes, sir; I told them.

Q. You know that it is the duty of the men to get punched in the morning, when they go out, and when they return at night?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you go to see Cuthbert Champagne to know which men had been punched and which men had not, in order to make easy the entries in your book?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. And he would give you the details, did he not?—A. He would give me the details at the punching booth, and I would verify at Mr. Lanctot's house, if the men had gone there.

Q. Then you went to Mr. Lanctot's house often during that time?—A. I would go morning, noon and in the evening.

Q. Every day?—A. Every day.

Q. During what space of time?—A. Whilst the painters were working.

Q. That would cover what space of time? June, July, August, October?—A. The months that are marked on my sheets.

Q. In the course of your calls to the house, three times a day, you saw Mr. Lanctot?—A. During all the time the work lasted, I saw Mr. Lanctot about seven or eight times.

Q. There on the work?—A. At the house?

Q. You had some paint and material also sent, Mr. Pagé—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At whose request?—A. Mr. Lanctot had asked me if it was not possible to get the material at Mr. Labelle's store, that we could borrow some from the government and that he would recoup it as soon as his work was done.

Q. When did you so meet Mr. Lanctot, and when did he tell you that?—A. I think it was in the beginning of the job.

Q. But not after you had sent men to work for him?—A. I cannot say, if it was after or before, but I remember all the same that he spoke to me about that.

Q. Did you ever go to Cyrille Labelle & Co. to get some paint and other material?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you take communication of the account of Cyrille Labelle & Co., Exhibit No. 15, as to what concerns the painting of Adelard Lanctot's house, in the year 1910, and say if there are in that account any painters' materials which have been asked by you, and tell us which.

(Witness examines account with Mr. McDougall and mentions the following items).

A. The first item is that of July 8: 2 dozen of sand paper; July 9, $\frac{1}{8}$ gal. shellac; July 19, panes of glass; July 20, panes of glass; July 27, sand paper; August 9, 12, 15 and 27, all the window panes and the shellac are carried to those dates, but not the brads.

August 23, 2 lbs. isinglass; August 27, $\frac{1}{4}$ -lb. bone-black; August 29, 35 lbs. putty; Sept. 10 and 27, sand paper; Oct. 17, sand paper; Oct. 18, $\frac{1}{8}$ alcoal; Oct. 18, sheets of paper; Oct. 26, sheets of paper; Nov. 12, 1 gal. shellac and $\frac{1}{2}$ doz. sand paper; Nov. 3, 1 gal. shellac; Nov. 5, 1 gal. varnish; Nov. 5, 1 gal. shellac; Nov. 9, $\frac{1}{2}$ gal. varnish; Nov. 14, $\frac{1}{4}$ gal. varnish; Nov. 15, $\frac{1}{2}$ gal. white enamel; Nov. 15, $\frac{1}{4}$ gal. turpentine; Nov. 15, 5 lbs. white; Nov. 15, $\frac{1}{4}$ gal. varnish; Nov. 17, $\frac{1}{8}$ gal. linseed oil and 1 box green.

Q. Is the item of Dec. 28 besides that?—A. It is besides.

Q. Those are all the items you got from Labelle & Co., for the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. All the other paints and materials have therefore come from the government's shops?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For the paints and materials supplied by the government's shops, will you look at Exhibit No. 20, and tell us if it is your signature which appears there at the bottom of the page?

(Witness takes communication of exhibit).

A. It is my signature, sir, and that is the amount.

Q. Who has put up that account, \$81.30?—A. I believe I put up that account myself.

Q. And what is that exhibit account No. 20? Is it a bill for what?—A. Paints putty, window panes, varnish.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Where did you take the details for that account?—A. I had a little memorandum book in my shop, and I took note of everything I delivered.

Q. You were the painter's foreman, and you had therefore the charge of certain paints and certain materials?—A. Yes.

Q. You have a clerk under you?—A. No, sir, I do the clerk myself.

Q. Does not Arthur Lavallée work with you?—A. He prepares the paints.

Q. When you wanted to get paints you had in stock, to whom did you go to?—A. I make a requisition, I send it to the office, and they send for the paint in the stock.

Q. You make a requisition in writing?—A. Yes.

Q. And to whom do you send that requisition?—A. I send that to the department's store.

Q. Massé, who is in charge of the store?—A. It is Mr. Coté, or Mr. Massé who receive these requisitions.

Q. And in answer to your requisitions, they send you the paints required?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You only send requisitions for what is necessary, I suppose?—A. For that which is needed.

Q. Did you send a requisition to Mr. Massé for the paint which you needed for Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why?—A. I prepared the paint, and it was put aside. It was a separate paint, apart from ours.

Q. Then, if I understand right, you used paint which you had already obtained from Mr. Massé, by means of requisitions for other works and you prepared that for Mr. Lanctot, in tubs which you had set aside. Is that it?—A. We took paint that we had in stock and prepared it for Mr. Lanctot.

Q. That you had in stock for other works?—A. Yes, yes, for our works.

Q. Under what authority did you use that paint?—A. I had examined the premises, the buildings, inside, and I had found that paint could not be prepared in the house; there were only the single floors. There was nothing finished. Only the walls were completed. There being at Mr. Lanctot's house no vessels large enough to prepare the paint, I prepared the paint in the shop.

Q. The question I put to you is this: Did you ask Mr. Papineau, or Mr. Perreault, or to any one in authority, leave to use these paints?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you weigh or measure these paints?—A. It is weighed.

Q. Where?—A. It is weighed by myself.

Q. Where?—A. At the shop.

Q. On scales which are in the middle of the shop?—A. In the shop. On scales we have there.

Q. Scales that are attached to the floor. Are they not?—A. Portable scales which we have.

The Committee then adjourned till to-morrow, the 22nd of March, 1911, at 10 o'clock, a.m.

APPENDIX No. 3

WEDNESDAY, March 22, 1911.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

JEAN BAPTISTE PAGÉ's examination was resumed.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. About the paint sent at Mr. Lanctot's, how many trips were made or how many times did you send some paint?—A. I did not notice the trips.

Q. You had to keep an account of them?—A. The paint was weighed 'en bloc' for Mr. Lanctot and when men came to get some for Mr. Lanctot, my man would give it to them.

Q. And you say the same thing happened for the putty, the oil, and so forth?—A. The paint, it was paint prepared 'en bloc' specially for Mr. Lanctot.

Q. What do you mean? Do you mean to say that you prepared it yourself?—A. Myself.

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot ask you to do that?—A. I do not know if Mr. Lanctot had an agreement with Mr. Papineau, but I prepared that myself in the shop because it was more convenient for ourselves and we had the paint there with us.

Q. If I understand correctly, some one told you to go to Cyrille Labelle & Co., to get the necessary quantity of paint for Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir. I asked for certain things and they did not keep them.

Q. What could not you have at Lapelle's?—A. I asked for a special varnish, some dyes and some yellow paint they didn't keep. That day I went there and they had not that in stock.

Q. I see in the account you have prepared for the paint, Exhibit No. 20, which is now shown to you, that you have an entry of 200 pounds of a certain sort of paint—some green paint, I think—and 300 pounds of another paint, yellow, I think; was that mixed once for all?—A. No, sir.

Q. Please give us the details. When did you prepare the 200 pounds of yellow and when did you prepare the 300 pounds of green?—A. The account shows the dates.

Q. Is it the account you call rough copy and you mentioned yesterday?—A. No, sir. The rough copy was a little note-book I kept in my copy, for my own satisfaction, to keep track of what was delivered.

Q. Where is that rough copy?—A. I looked for it in the shop and could not find it. It was in some books I had in the shop.

Q. Were the entries made in the books of the department for the 200 pounds of paint and the 300 pounds of paint mixed for Mr. Lanctot?—A. I told you a moment ago, it is a rough copy I had in the books of the shop, outside the government books. That was apart; it was not to be entered in the government books; it was for Mr. Lanctot specially.

Q. And you have't got that rough copy with you and you cannot find it in the shop?—A. I do not know if it was mislaid with some other papers I had.

Q. Then, if I understand correctly, no entry was made, in any of the government books, for the paint supplied for Mr. Lanctot?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then, how did you manage to make the account now produced as Exhibit No. 20?—A. I made it up from the rough copy I had, the first entries I made. As soon as the paint had been prepared and as soon as some left the shop. The first day we delivered some, I made a note of it that same day.

Q. You did not do that on each occasion?—A. No, no; I entered the first delivery we made. It was understood that the paint had been weighed for Mr. Lanctot and it was not to be used for any other person; it was intended for him.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. You had to make special colours, you said?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who asked you to make those special colours?—A. —

Q. Somebody must have asked you to prepare those special colours? Who?—A. Mr. Lanctot talked to me about preparing some colours, but the order was not coming from him, I did not receive any order from Mr. Lanctot. All I know about Mr. Lanctot is that he told me that all I could not find in Sorel, in the stores, I should borrow it from the government. I suppose he had an interview with Mr. Papineau and there was an understanding to that effect. I understood that Mr. Papineau authorized him to do that. And, for my part, I prepared the paint in the shades he asked for.

Q. But you did not dream of those special shades you prepared; somebody must have asked you for them. Is it Mr. Lanctot?—A. No, I did not dream of them; Mr. Lanctot had asked me to prepare those shades for his house.

Q. And you did so?—A. I did so.

Q. In the rough copies you made, are the dates when you made that mixing of paint also the days you sent men, entered?—A. No, sir. I want to be well understood: the paint was weighed when it was prepared and it was understood that it was not to go any place else but to Mr. Lanctot's. When a quantity of paint is weighed for a building or any other work, it is no use measuring it every minute, every time you use some. The weight was there and it was delivered like that.

Q. Do you want us to understand that you measured and weighed beforehand the quantity of paint to be used at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I prepared the paint and when it was prepared, specially the yellow—Every time I have prepared some paint—I prepared it on two different occasions, the yellow first then the green. When I prepared the yellow, I did weigh it and there was 300 pounds of paint ready to be used.

Q. Yellow?—A. Yellow.

Q. Then, it was prepared beforehand, before the paint was sent to Mr. Lanctot's?—A. It was prepared the day that work was started.

Q. Can you say what day it was when you began?

(Witness refers to an account.)

A. We began on the 13th of October for this work.

Q. I am speaking to you of the paint which was used for the house of Mr. Lanctot. And you had not had paint carried to Mr. Lanctot's house before the 13th October, 1910?—A. Yes, sir; we sent some.

Q. Let us understand one another. You said a moment ago that you mixed the paint when you began to work at Mr. Lanctot's house, which was the 13th of October. Now you say you sent paint before that?—A. I am speaking about that paint, the yellow paint which we prepared.

Q. Then, tell us about the green paint; when did you send green paint for the first time?—A. Green paint, it was in September.

Q. Will you swear that you did not send some green paint to Mr. Lanctot's house before the month of September?—A. I did not send any green paint before that time, that I swear.

Q. Do you remember the names of the men who brought the paint to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who are they?—A. The one who brought paint the oftenest was Omer Pagé.

Q. Who beside him?—A. Henri Paul.

Q. Is Henri Paul a painter?—A. No, he is a man whom we keep at the shop to g. on messages.

Q. Beside these two, are there others who helped in carrying paint?—A. No, sir; not one.

Q. Henri Proulx did not help in carrying paint?—A. No, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Not to your knowledge, I suppose?—A. I never gave orders to Henri Proulx to carry paint to Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. Did you ever see him carry some?—A. I never saw him.

Q. Now, during the month of August or July, did not Henri Paul and Omer Pagé carry paint to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. In the month of July Omer Pagé carried some.

Q. Assisted by Henri Paul?—A. I do not recollect.

Q. Did others than Omer Pagé carry some in the month of July?—A. No, sir.

Q. Now, does the name of Henri Paul appear in the account of the time of the men which you gave, Exhibit No. 2, and which you say you have prepared?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why did you not keep trace of his time?—A. It was because the paint was being carried between half past twelve and one o'clock.

Q. Do you not know that the men who were working at Mr. Lanctot's house often had to wait for paint which was to come from the government shops?—A. The men were carrying the paint between the work hours of the government.

Q. And Henri Paul always did the same?—A. It was he who took across the operatives who were carrying the paint, and those who carried paint would punch his card before leaving, and he was having to return in an hour.

Q. Now, Mr. Pagé, please look at the account, Exhibit No. 2.

(The witness takes communication of the account.)

Q. You see it is the account which yesterday you said you had prepared for the work of the men, except the three journeymen whose names are at the foot of the bill?—A. This one, it was not I who prepared it, but it was made from the one which I prepared.

Q. The items are the same as the ones you furnished?—A. The one I prepared is the same as this, except the last four names.

Q. At what date did you prepare this account?—A. When the job was over.

Q. When was it? Do you see that the account bears a date?—A. In the month of November.

Q. Look at the heading?—A. That is it, it was on the 21st of November.

Q. Was the 21st of November the day on which you prepared this account for the time of the men?—A. I prepared it right away as soon as the job was over, because I had been asked for it.

Q. Who had asked you for it?—A. Mr. Champagne asked me for it.

Q. Oscar Champagne?—A. Oscar Champagne.

Q. Why was he asking you for this account? Had anybody asked him to supply it?—A. He asked me to prepare it as soon as I could, as Mr. Lanctot had been asking him for it two or three times.

Q. Now, if such is the case, will you say why you did not prepare at the same time the account for the green paint which had been supplied to Mr. Lanctot, and which is included in this account, Exhibit No. 2?—A. I do not know if the account for paint has been made at the same time, but as soon as Mr. Champagne asked me to prepare it, I prepared it for him.

Q. Was it Mr. Champagne who asked you to supply the account for paint?—A. He asked me to produce both accounts so that Mr. Lanctot might have them.

Q. You produced the paint account only in December, Mr. Pagé?—A. I do not remember, sir.

Q. Now, under oath, to the best of your knowledge, when did you prepare the paint account?—A. I prepared it when Mr. Champagne asked me for it. I do not remember the date.

Q. Was it before December?—A. I think it was before December.

Q. Did you not know that there were complaints, affidavits and solemn statements at the time when you prepared the account for paint supplied to Mr. Lanctot?—A. I did not know there were some affidavits signed against Mr. Lanctot.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. When did you hear the first time about those affidavits?—A. I for the first time heard when the affidavits were. . . . I heard that at the shop, at our own shop.

Q. When?—A. It was a few days before there was any question of our coming here.

Q. Coming here as witness?—A. Yes, before. There were some discussions being held upon the subject. At the shop, between the men, the discussions were never serious.

Q. You say that you never ordered Mr. Henri Proulx to carry paint to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you not know when Mr. Proulx went to the church. . . . You know that he went to the church? Did he not carry some paint with Mr. Paul and Omer Pagé?—A. I never gave Mr. Proulx any orders to carry paint to Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. I am asking you if, when Mr. Proulx went to the church he did not help Henri Paul and Omer Pagé to carry some paint to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I never gave Mr. Proulx any orders to go and work at the church.

Q. Will you look at the pay-list now before the Committee and say, if, for the first half of the month of August, 1910, in the pay-list No. 148, you find your name, Jean Baptiste Pagé, as a painter?—A. Yes, my name—I do not know if it appears on the list, in the heading of the list which the government was making—my name was supposed to disappear from our books; I did not do any punching, my name was disappearing.

Q. You find your name there?—A. Yes.

Q. And opposite your name you find No. 276?—A. That is my number.

Q. And opposite your name is the amount \$85, being the amount of your monthly wages, and for that half of the month of August, you received \$42.50?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You also find the name of Henri Proulx?—A. Yes, I see it there.

Q. No. 283?—A. Yes.

Q. He has received his pay for one half of the month of August \$22?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Henri Proulx works under you as foreman?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Look at the end of the month of August, being pay-list 149, being for the latter half of the month of August, 1910?—A. I find my name, No. 276.

Q. And you received your wages for that half month, \$42.50?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And do you find the name of Henri Proulx?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He received his wages for that half month?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He worked under your orders?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where was he working?—A. In the government shops.

Q. Where?—A. He was working in the buildings, I think; around the buildings, I think.

Q. As foreman, you ought to be able to locate this man?—A. At the time, we were painting the inside of the building, and we had some new buildings, which were going on at the time.

Q. This is not answering my question as to Henri. Do you say that he was working at those new buildings?—A. He may have worked there, and may also have worked at the buildings, the men were being changed.

Q. Can you not tell us as foreman of the painters, from this pay-list and from other records in your possession where Henri Proulx was working during the month of August, 1910?—A. I told you, Mr. McDougall.

Q. You are the one who controls the work of these men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are the one who sends them to the special pieces of work which have to be done?—A. I am the one who sends them out; but, when you have sixty men to

APPENDIX No. 3

whom you have to give work every morning you cannot remember from one day to the other which one has worked at the buildings or at the new buildings.

Q. Do you swear that Henri Proulx, during August never went out of the government work to go to Sorel, at Mr. Lanctot's house or somewhere else, under your orders?

—A. I swear that Henri Proulx never carried any paint under my orders to the house of Mr. Lanctot.

At the request of Mr. McDougall, the preceding question is read again to the witness as follows:—

Q. Do you swear that Henri Proulx, during August, never went out of the government work to go to Sorel, at Mr. Lanctot's house or somewhere else, under your orders?

—A. I swear as to Mr. Lanctot's house; elsewhere, I did not follow Mr. Proulx.

Q. I am not asking you if you followed him, I am asking you if he went elsewhere under your orders?

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to this question.

The objection is maintained by the Chairman.

Q. When you prepared the account for paint, you are unable to say if it was before the month of December, or in the beginning of December?—A. I cannot say.

Q. Do you remember to whom you gave it?—A. To Mr. Oscar Champagne.

Q. Do you know if the paint has been refunded?—A. The paint has been returned. It is not I who received it.

Q. I am asking you if you know that it has been returned?—A. It has been returned.

Q. To whom was it returned?—A. It was returned to the shop, to my shop man who prepares the paint.

Q. Whose name is?—A. Arthur Lavallée.

Q. Is it not a fact that it was about the 10th of December that you gave the paint account either to Mr. Champagne or to Mr. Papineau?—A. I do not remember the date.

Q. Is it not possible that it may have been the 10th of December?—A. I cannot say.

Q. Was it a week or two weeks after you had made the account for the men?—A. I do not remember the date.

Q. Did you take the particulars from your private sheet or from the books of the department?—A. No, it was a memo for myself.

Q. Is there not to be found in your small book, Exhibit 23, a summary of that paint work?—A. I had entered it as a memorandum. There should be one.

Q. Is that the blotter of which you speak?—A. No, sir.

Q. Look at your book, Exhibit 23, and say if you do not find there two entries upon two different pages, containing a summary or a copy or a blotter of the paint supplied?

—A. Yes sir, here it is.

Q. It is an entry made on the printed page, under the heading of 'July, Friday 28'?—A. Yes, but it was not in that month. That is the copy of the paint which I had delivered which had been added, upon which the account was made.

Q. That is your hand-writing?—A. It is my hand-writing. I kept that as a memorandum.

Q. Is it the only memorandum which you have kept as to this paint, in that book, Exhibit 23?—A. Here is the same copy here. I transcribed it in ink.

Q. You find another entry to the same effect made in lead pencil, two pages before the ink entry?—A. I transcribed it in ink on this side to better keep the memorandum.

Q. At what date did you make this entry. It is not so long ago, it is only two or three months ago?—A. I prepared that, sir, before I gave the account to Mr. Champagne, in order to keep a copy of it.

Q. Can you give us an idea of the size of Mr. Lanctot's house, of the quantity of paint required there, either by the yard or otherwise?—A. I have not measured it.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. You measured the house did you not? You were there three times a day, you say?—A. I was not the contractor, it was not my business to measure the house.

Q. Do you swear that you have no idea of the size of Mr. Lanctot's house, that you took no measurements in order that you might know what amount of paint was needed?—A. I never measured Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot ever give you the size of his house, either interiorly or exteriorly, the number of rooms, or the amount of paint that he needed?—A. No, sir.

Q. You never tried yourself to find that out?—A. No, sir. It was not my business either.

Q. Do you know by yourself the size of that house?—A. I did not know it at all.

Q. Will you allow me to read from your book, Exhibit 23 what follows: 'Size of the Lanctot house, length 38½ feet, breadth 27½ feet., Will you look at your book Exhibit 23, and tell us if that which I have just read is in your hand-writing?—A. I do not know if I understood right your question of a few minutes ago. You asked me, during the work, did I measure the building.

The Chairman:

Q. Is that book in your hand-writing?—A. Yes, it was I who made that; but not during the progress of the work.

Q. When did you make that entry?—A. I did not understand your question of a few minutes ago. I thought you asked me during the work which was performed at Mr. Lanctot's house, if I had not measured the work done on the building.

Q. You tell us now that the entry I just read in your book was not made during the time the work was going on at Lanctot's?—A. No.

Q. When?—A. It had been done two or three days before coming here.

Q. You took the care to do the measuring before coming here?—A. I took the measures on the plans. I got the plans and I measured.

Q. Do those plans correspond with your estimation at a glance when you were where the work was done?—A. I took the measures which were concerning me.

Q. What does that mean: as far as you were concerned?—A. For the painting, the number of yards of painting there could be inside and outside.

Q. If I understand correctly then, when the work was finished you went to the house, where, from the plans, you wanted to fix for yourself or some one else, the number of yards of painting?—A. It was in order to make up the amount, the number of yards of painting which had been done there, which had been painted, for me, for myself.

Q. And you found out how large was the house?—A. From the quantities given by the plans.

Q. Please look at that memorandum, Exhibit 23, on the page referring to the printed entry: 'July, Wednesday, 26,' and tell us if you find an entry to that effect: Memorandum of the number of yards to be painted at Lanctot's house:

Cornice, 50 yards, plain.

Gallery, 150 yards, plain.

Plinths of the frames, 120 yards.

Openings, 120 yards.

Woodwork and stairs, 45 yards.

Outside, square.

Tell us who wrote that entry, and when it was done?—A. I made that entry myself, sir.

Q. It has been made before the painting?—A. After.

Q. Why did you make that memorandum?—A. I thought I better measure all those things for my own satisfaction, in order that if other work of the same kind was done, I would be in a position to fix a price—to be able to make it more accurate.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. How long after the work was done did you make that entry?—A. I made it, I suppose, one month later. Two weeks later—two weeks.

Q. Was it before you handed your account for the paint or after?—A. I cannot tell.

Q. Look at the page of your book, Exhibit 23, under the printed heading: 'June, Monday, 26,' and tell us if you find an entry to the following effect: 'Number of yards of coating in Lanctot's house is 1,000 yards. The date of the lathing, 31st of May. The first coat was put on the 13th of June and the second, with the finishing touch to the walls, ended about the beginning of July.' Is that your writing?—A. Yes, yes. I made the measuring the same day.

Q. You have a good memory? You say, here, in the entry, Monday, 26th of June, that the date of the lathing at Mr. Lanctot's is the 31st of May. How can you tell us, if that entry was made after the work was done, that the date of the lathing is the 31st of May? Where does that come from?—A. At noon, when I was going to dine, I met the plasterers, those who did the coating, and I asked them the date and the number of yards there was in the building—all that between us.

Q. It happened after the work was done?—A. After the work was done.

Q. They were not employees of the government, were they?—A. No, sir.

Q. Whose plasterers were they, whose employees were they?—A. Those who worked are jobbers, they work for themselves.

Q. Name some of them?—A. M. Deguise.

Q. His first name?—A. Andre Deguise.

Q. And the coating was started on the 13th of June?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The plastering started the 13th of June?—A. Yes.

Q. Who gave you that information?—A. Mr. Deguise.

Q. The same man?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. After all was done?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the finishing touch to the walls was all done about the beginning of July?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From the notes I find in your book, there is in the inside of the house six rooms, including the bath room and leaving aside the hall. Downstairs: kitchen, office, diningroom, parlour, boudoir, passage. The measures are . . . I cannot read your writing; read them yourself, if you please.

(Witness reading from the book.)

A. 'Inside, there are six rooms, including bath room, passage. Downstairs: kitchen, office, diningroom, parlour, boudoir, passage. The measures are 12 x 13 and 9 x 13 inches.'

Q. Did the paymaster, Desire Champagne, know that some employees of the government were working at Adelard Lanctot's?—A. I cannot tell.

Q. Did you bring that to his attention, yourself?—A. Never, sir.

Q. In 1908—not in 1910—was there any painting done at the house Mr. Lanctot was occupying then and which was a house rented by him and if so, did any of the employees of the government work there?—A. I do remember that a man worked for Mr. Lanctot, doing the papering of the rooms.

Q. Who is that man?—A. Alfred Douaire.

Q. Is there a man named Payette who worked there?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was Payette in the employ of the government then?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you say that he did not work at Mr. Lanctot's, doing some painting?—A. He worked at Mr. Lanctot's, yes.

Q. A last question. Mr. Pagé. Yesterday you said something about paint you had in stock, you got that paint from Norman Massé?—A. Not directly from him. He is supposed to supply us with the goods.

Q. Are there any others than Norman Massé who supply you with those goods?—A. There is another one who comes and delivers the material.

Q. Yes, but coming from Massé's?—A. Our orders are given to Mr. Massé.

Q. And Mr. Massé sends you the goods by a messenger?—A. Yes, he sends them by somebody else.

Q. Then, that comes from Massé?—A. Yes, yes, it comes from Massé.

Q. Those orders are made for special workers, I suppose; when you make an order, it is not to have some material that you would keep in stock, it is for some special work?—A. We always have a stock of paint. If we need 500 pounds of paint or 2,000 pounds or 4,000 pounds we ask for in advance. We prepare the paint beforehand. We do not prepare only few pounds of paint at the same time, we prepare thousand pounds at the same time.

Q. That is for your special work?—A. It is for the works done for the government.

By Mr. Barker:

Q. When the paint was returned to the government, were any entries made in the government books showing that the paint had been returned?—A. The paint was checked at the shop.

Q. I am asking you if any entry had been made in the government books to show that the paint had been returned?—A. It must have been done, because the bill passed through the office.

Q. Where would that book be in which the entries have been made showing that the paint had been returned?—A. In the store.

Q. The store-keeper would then have that book?—A. Yes.

Q. When the goods left the department to go to Mr. Lanctot's house, were any entries made to show that those goods had been taken out?—A. The entry had been made in the book, in the small rough copy I had.

Q. Not in the government books?—A. No, sir.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C.:

Q. Is it not a fact that when Mr. Lanctot talked to you about the work mentioned he told you: 'As to the material, you will go and get it at Cyrille Labelle & Co., where I have an open account'?—A. Yes, sir, he mentioned Cyrille Labelle to me.

Q. Did he tell you that he had an account at Cyrille Labelle's?—A. He told me to take from the government, to borrow from the government, all I could not find at Cyrille Labelle's.

Q. Is it not a fact that, on that occasion, you told him: 'For the kind of work you want to be done, you could perhaps have some difficulty to get the paint here'?—A. Yes, sir; I remember that very well.

Q. Did he not ask you then: 'Could one borrow some from the department'?—A. I think he spoke to me that way.

Q. Now, Mr. Pagé, did he not add the following words, or in substance the following words: 'If you can take some paint or material at the department, will you oblige me in keeping a separate account, and gradually I will replace the material borrowed'?—A. Mr. Lanctot told me that if I borrowed some material from the government I would have to keep an account of all I would take.

Q. Now, in what kind of receiver did you put aside the paint intended for Mr. Lanctot's house?

The WITNESS.—What kind of tub, you mean?

The COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. They are big tubs we had. There were none like that at Sorel, and, as we had some available at the government shops, I decided to take those tubs to put the paint for Mr. Lanctot apart from the other.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. So that as to the quantity of paint he was to borrow from the department, Mr. Lanctot relied absolutely upon you?—A. Yes, sir, he was to rely upon me.

Q. One thing certain, Mr. Pagé, is that you have not sent to Mr. Lanctot's house any other paint, putty or material, as oil and so forth, except the quantity you had put aside for that purpose?—A. No, sir.

Q. And not only that, Mr. Pagé, but I am informed that a certain quantity of paint was left in the tubs?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that quantity of paint was charged to Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes.

Mr. McDougall, K.C., counsel for Mr. Blondin, objects to that question or any other question referring to charges made to Mr. Lanctot, except if they are shown, what has not been done.

Question allowed by the Chairman.

Q. Is it not true, Mr. Page, that this quantity of unused paint, which remained in those tubs when the works were completed, was however, included in the statement prepared by you in order to recover the paint which had been borrowed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that Mr. Lanctot paid for more paint than he had really received? It amounts to that, does it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He paid for a little more paint than he had received?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, Mr. Pagé, you stated that on no occasion you gave orders to Henri Proulx to carry materials at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. Never, sir.

Q. You swore to that, that you never gave instructions to that effect?—A. I swore that I never gave Mr. Proulx any instructions to that effect.

Q. Did you ever tell Henri Proulx, or Henri Paul or Omer Pagé, in the presence of Henri Proulx, that while going from the government's shop to Mr. Lanctot's house, to take materials there, they should be careful not to be seen by Mr. Papineau, the superintendent of the yard?

Mr. McDougall, K.C., objects to that question as being illegal and irregular, and contrary to the rules on evidence inasmuch as it is not derived from the examination in chief.

The objection is dismissed by the Chairman.

—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever tell Henri Proulx, or Omer Pagé, or Henri Paul, in the presence of Proulx, that they must avoid been seen by the Sorel merchants?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have an idea of the value of paint, Mr. Pagé?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, would a sum of \$81 be a fair and reasonable value for the quantity of materials, either in paint or in putty, which was furnished for Mr. Lanctot's house?

—A. By the government?

Q. Yes. A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, do you know, that besides the painters whose names appear on Exhibit No. 2, no other painter in the employ of the government has worked at the Lanctot house, and has been paid by the government without the latter being reimbursed?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Now, why were you in the habit of going three times a day to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. It was because Mr. Lanctot had asked me, as a friend, to accept the job of supervising the works, as a favour to him, because he was away.

Q. So that, not only did Mr. Lanctot depend upon you as to the quantity of the materials furnished, but he also depended upon you altogether as to the quantity of work done?—A. He asked me to superintend the work for him, as a special favour.

Q. So that you might have charged him for more paint and more work than he has received and he would not have noticed it?—A. I might have charged him more had I been so inclined.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Now, you say Mr. Lanctot was absent. Was he absent during the months of July, August and September?—A. From the month of June until the last month in which we worked there, I saw Mr. Lanctot to speak to him, seven or eight times.

Q. Is it not true that on certain occasions he absented himself from Sorel for a week, or even two weeks, on one occasion?—A. It was even more than two weeks, I have been three weeks without seeing him.

Q. The notes you have prepared either as to the quantity of paint, or as to the amount of work were in order to inform the department and for the information of Mr. Lanctot as well?—A. Yes, sir, I did so in order that the government might be informed, and Mr. Lanctot as well.

Q. How many years have you been in the employ of the government at Sorel, Mr. Pagé?—A. Three years.

Q. What did you do before that?—A. I was a contractor.

Q. Where?—A. In the town of Sorel and in the surrounding country.

Q. Are you ready to swear, Mr. Pagé, that the government have not lost a cent, either through the materials supplied to the Lanctot house, or the work done at the Lanctot house, by the department, remembering that Mr. Lanctot has paid \$375.62 for the work and \$81 for the material?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. \$375 and \$81 amount to \$456 which were paid by Mr. Lanctot. If you were taking a contract for yourself, for your own house, would you do the work for that amount? Could you do it for that amount?—A. I would have taken the job for \$500, including 20 per cent.

Q. 20 per cent of profit?—A. 20 per cent of profit.

Q. That would make a profit of \$100. A. Yes

Q. So that the cost price of such a job as that would be \$400—A. A man knowing something about the paint work which has been done at Mr. Lanctot's would have taken that work for much cheaper than four hundred dollars.

Q. Now, that list, Exhibit No. 2, so far nobody has complained about it, except Mr. Douaire. Now, Mr. Pagé, do you swear that Mr. Douaire has not worked at Mr. Lanctot's house any longer than already mentioned in this list, Exhibit No. 2?

Mr. McDougall, K.C., counsel for Mr. Blondin, objects to that question as being illegal, irregular and contrary to the rules of the evidence, in so far as it does not derive from the chief examination.

Objection is dismissed by the Chairman.

—A. I swear that the time entered for Mr. Douaire in my books, and entered also for him on this list, is correct.

Q. And those notes, you have taken them every day?—A. Every evening.

Q. For the express purpose of checking the time of all the men and of every man working there?—A. Certainly. Such was also my duty.

Q. Now, Mr. Pagé, will you briefly tell in what circumstances that man Douaire and that other man Payette went to Mr. Lanctot's house, on King street, in the fall of 1908, one to paper and the other to paint Mr. Lanctot's house on King street?—A. Payette never worked at Mr. Lanctot's house on King street, while Douaire was papering.

Q. Will you relate in what circumstances Mr. Douaire went to Mr. Lanctot's, on King street, to do some paper-hanging?—A. Mrs. Lanctot came to my house one day to ask me to do her the favour of papering three rooms which she had and were untidy. She told me that she expected visitors, and that if I could get those rooms papered I would render her a great service, while all the time being paid for same.

Q. Now, Mr. Pagé, we will try to reduce that incident to its natural proportions. At that time, were you keeping a store?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What kind of a store was it?—A. I was keeping paper-hangings.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. And I suppose that Mrs. Lanctot went to your store to give you that order in an ordinary way?—A. She came to ask me to do some work for her, as I had the stock on hand.

Q. So, she went to see you, not because you were the foreman of the government's painters, but because you were in trade as a paper-hanger?—A. It must be that.

Q. What did you answer to Mrs. Lanctot?—A. I told Mrs. Lanctot that I could not go myself, but I told her: 'I will send you a man to do that work for you all right.'

Q. So, Mr. Page, it was you who suggested to Mrs. Lanctot to send her a man on the other side of the river?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Whom did you send?—A. Alfred Douaire.

Q. How long has he worked there?—A. Two days and a half.

Q. How much did he get for that work?—A. Five dollars.

Q. Where did he get the paper?—A. For the ceilings, I had quite a stock on hand. For the walls, I showed to Mrs. Lanctot the samples I had. She accepted paper from my stock for the ceilings, but for the walls she could not find anything to suit her. She wanted something of a newer design. I went to Mr. Hardy, where I got some samples. I showed those other samples to Mrs. Lanctot, and after she had made a choice I sent Douaire to do the work.

Q. And you have charged to Mrs. Lanctot the price of the paper?—A. I charged it to Mrs. Lanctot's name. I had nothing to do at all with Mr. Lanctot.

Q. You charged to Mrs. Lanctot the price of the paper?—A. The paper has been charged to Mrs. Lanctot.

Q. And you also charged her the labour?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In your books?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In your own books, belonging to you?—A. Yes, together with sundry small accounts I had.

Q. So, Mr. Pagé, it all comes to this: You have made a personal transaction, absolutely distinct, and you paid Mr. Douaire with your own money?—A. The government had nothing to do with that at all.

Q. And that is the reason for which said transaction does not appear in the government's books?—A. That thing could not have got it into the government's books. I paid Douaire. When somebody pays a man himself, the government does not pay him.

Q. Now, tell us in what circumstances that man Payette went at that house to do some paint work in the fall of 1908?—A. I could not say. I have not seen him.

Q. Did he report that he had done some paint work there?—A. Never.

Q. Did some one, at the department, in your presence, give instructions to Mr. Payette to go to Mr. Lanctot's to do paint work in the fall of 1908?—A. No, sir.

Q. As far as you are aware, Payette has never done any painting or papering in that house?—A. I never saw Payette work there.

Q. In August, 1910, did you ever ask Henri Proulx to go across with Omer Pagé and Henri Paul, so as to help them carrying paint at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. No, sir.

Q. Now, you say that you have measured the house a few days before coming here to Ottawa?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Naturally, Mr. Pagé, you were expecting to be summoned before this committee?—A. That was why I took those measurements.

Q. In other words, you took the measurement of the house so as to be able to give your evidence in a more satisfactory manner?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it you who dismissed Henri Proulx on November the 5th?—A. I had orders from Mr. Papineau, through Mr. Champagne, to make a list of 16 and to dismiss them. I was not to dismiss them directly myself, but I had orders to make up a list of those men to dismiss them on the same day—the day when they were cleared.

Q. I suppose, Mr. Pagé, that when you make such a list of men who are to be

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

discharged, you pick out the bad and indifferent, and you keep the good ones?—A. It is usually so.

Q. Why did you discharge Proulx, among others?

Mr. McDougall, K.C., counsel for Mr. Blondin, objects to this question as being illegal, irregular, inasmuch as it is not derived from the chief examination.

Mr. Laflamme withdraws his question.

Q. Now, what kind of work did Mr. Douaire do when he worked at Mr. Lanctot's house on George street?—A. He continued the tinting commenced by Omer Pagé inside the building.

Q. Did he work outside?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. I suppose the painting outside was begun before the painting inside?—A. The painting was commenced outside first.

Q. If that is right, Mr. Douaire worked towards the last, when they begun to paint the inside?—A. He began in the month of September, Mr. Douaire.

Q. You have no interest whatever in this investigation?—A. None whatever, sir. Re-examined by Mr. McDougall, K.C., counsel for Mr. Blondin:

Q. You say, then, that as to the work on King street, at the house on King street, that it was done as a favour to Mrs. Lanctot?

Mr. Laflamme objects to this question.

Q. Was it as a favour, or for payment, that Mrs. Lanctot called and asked you to go and paint the house on King street?—A. She asked me to do that work for her as a favour, as she was expecting company, and said that while I would be well paid, I would do her a great favour.

Q. At that time, in 1908, you told me that you were keeping a wallpaper store?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you explain to us how it is that the keeper of a wallpaper store, when customers call upon him, is asked by the customers to do them favours?—A. She was right in asking them, for she could not get anybody to do that kind of work.

Q. At that time, you were also in the employ of the department as foreman of the painters?—A. Yes, sir. It was the last year that I kept wallpaper for sale.

Q. You kept a small store besides?—A. A wallpaper store.

Q. And when she came and asked you to do that work, you told her that you had not time to do it?—A. I told her that I could not go myself, because I was foreman for the government, I always refused those who asked me.

Q. But you told her that you would get a government man to do the work?—A. I did not speak about the government.

Q. It seems to me you said you would get a man to do the work?—A. I told her I would send a man.

Q. And you sent Alfred Douaire?—A. I did not mention the name to her.

Q. As a matter of fact, you sent her Alfred Douaire?—A. I sent Alfred Douaire, I said I would send her a man to do her work.

Q. And, in fact, you sent Alfred Douaire?—A. I sent Alfred Douaire.

Q. At that time Alfred Douaire was working under you, as foreman of the painters, at the government's yards?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, you went to Alfred Douaire and you said to him, go to Mrs. Lanctot's, or Mr. Lanctot's on King street?—A. I did not have to go to him. Alfred Douaire was at the shop at noon. I sent him at noon to Mrs. Lanctot's, I said to him. 'Don't punch your card and go to work at Mrs. Lanctot's to paper three rooms there.'

Q. Do you remember on what date that was?—A. It was towards the end of October, sir, in the last days of October.

Q. Do you know whether Alfred Douaire's time was paid by the government, in the month of October?—A. It ought not to have been paid by the government. I paid it myself.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. I am asking you, if you know it, whether it was paid by the government or not?—A. No, sir.

Q. You don't know it?—A. No.

Q. You paid it yourself, when?—A. In the afternoon on which he finished the job, at about half past five o'clock, p.m.

Q. Did you make an entry in your book?—A. It is not necessary to make an entry for giving a man two or three days work.

Q. You made no entry in the books of the store which you kept in Sorel?—A. I make entries of the wallpaper I sold, I made entries of the money I gave for that. I made an entry of the money I had paid to get the wall paper and. . . .

Q. In your cash book, did you not keep account of the disbursement of \$5 which you gave to Alfred Douaire?—A. I was not keeping books like the big stores in Montreal.

Q. You kept no books at all?—A. We sold for cash.

Q. When you settled with Mr. or Mrs. Lanctot, how did you settle about the \$5 you had paid out?—A. I made a charge for the whole, for the time and the wall paper furnished.

Q. All in one item? Have you the account?—A. I have not the account. The moment I gave up selling wallpaper, I had nothing more to sell, I was foreman at the government, I had no business to keep. . . .

Q. How much did you charge in all to Mrs. Lanctot?—A. I do not remember exactly, I destroyed that book, I had no business to sell wallpaper.

Q. So that you can remember the payments you made to one particular individual, but you cannot remember the total amount?—A. I remember the time I paid to Mr. Douaire and the wallpaper I paid, I did not have it on hand, I paid that to Mr. Hardy of Sorel.

Q. You can give us no idea of the total amount?—A. That book has disappeared.

Q. Have you ever been repaid for that payment?—A. I must have been paid by Mrs. Lanctot.

Q. I ask you, under your oath, if you have been repaid?—A. I don't remember.

Q. You remember the payment, but you cannot remember the refund?—A. I don't remember.

Q. You were interested in that, though?—A. I don't remember.

Q. Neither for the paper, nor for Douaire's work, you cannot remember if that account has been paid by Mr. Lanctot or by Mrs. Lanctot?—A. I don't remember, because my books were destroyed and I have not been able—I don't remember that, if I have been paid, or----

Q. Did you ever ask Mrs. or Mr. Lanctot for a refund, and, indeed, have you ever been repaid?—A. I remember that Mrs. Lanctot asked me once for her bill, and I don't remember if I gave it to her.

Q. You say there was some paint left after completion of the work at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You said, if I well understood you, that it was charged to Mr. Lanctot?—A. The paint was charged as a whole to Mr. Lanctot.

Q. In what book?—A. Not in the government's book, mentioned on the accounts which have been given.

Q. There is no entry at all for the government's book?—A. The paint which has been charged to Mr. Lanctot's name, it was the paint left in the tub, paint left to spare, in the tub.

Q. What have you done with that paint left to spare?—A. What was left to spare was employed in painting the inside of barges, with other mixed paints.

Q. The time spent at Mr. Lanctot's house has been paid to you by the government, and is not entered in the Exhibit Account No. 2?—A. The government had no business

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

to pay me any time at morning, noon and at night. I was then outside of the government.

Q. You could get along without meals, I suppose, whilst looking about Mr. Lanctot's work?—A. No, sir, but the house is directly opposite mine as I am directly opposite to you.

Q. At Mr. Lanctot's house, how many coats of paint did you apply?—A. Three coats for the inside and the outside.

Q. Three coats?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Green or yellow paint?—A. There were two coats of green paint applied, and one coat of 'priming'; the first coat; then two coats of green, which makes three coats.

Q. In all the rooms?—A. On the outside. For the inside there was a coat on the walls—a mixture in oil, paint—and two coats of yellow.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is that for the woodwork or only for the walls?—A. There were three coats applied everywhere; on the woodwork, on the walls, everywhere.

Q. The plastered walls?—A. The glazing.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. The painting was done on the plastering, the glazing, the woodwork, the stairs?—A. The painting was done on the glazing. As for the plinths, the woodwork, the window casings, those were dyed.

Q. And the floor?—A. It was shellacked and varnished.

Q. Was there any polishing done?—A. There was some polishing of the doors of the lower story. The doors and the plinths.

Q. Was there not much polishing done?—A. Not more than usual, for a house of that size.

Q. To the best of your judgment, Mr. Pagé, under your oath, how many yards of paint-work have you done at the Lanctot house?—A. The measurements which have been entered in that book are for the work in full. As for the rooms, in the upper story, only the ceilings have been painted and the walls at three quarters height. . . . No, I am mistaken, there were only the ceilings and a border of eighteen inches at the top.

Q. How many yards would that make?—A. I have not figured that up.

Q. Then, why did you make an entry in your book for the number of yards which were to be painted at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. I took those measurements only to know the quantity that there was in the whole house. I have not figured that up only for the paint work which had been done.

Q. In deducting what has not been painted, how many yards would there be left?—A. I have not figured that up at all.

Q. Can you do it now?—A. Am I obliged to do it?

Q. From now to adjournment?—A. Because, sir, I want to make you observe that we have never been asked to work by the yard. In Sorel, we are only considering the whole.

Q. All the time, you know all about paint work by the yard, and you make entries about that in your book?—A. I know what that is.

Q. I ask you to figure up how many yards there are in that house to be painted, after deductions of what is not painted?—A. . . .

Q. As for the contracts taken up by your painters for the government, is there a job number where they work in particular, for government work?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to all evidence tendering to show that any of the men whose names appear on Exhibit No. 2 have been entered with their serial numbers as having been employed in department work while working at Mr. Lanctot's, as that has nothing to do with the object of the inquest.

The above question is read a second time to witness.

A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Have you any books?—A. The numbers given for government jobs, the lists remain in the shop, the order numbers.

Q. In your own shop, you would then have a job number?—A. There are loose sheets with an order number.

Q. Among your loose sheets, is there an order number for the work at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you got books showing that, at the dates mentioned in your book Exhibit 23, the men you mention in the account Exhibit 2 were working elsewhere than at Mr. Lanctot's for the government?—A. I have not those books. I have only got sheets for order numbers, and when we are through with a number. . . .

Q. Have you got the sheets of the order numbers to show the dates. . . .—A. They are in the government shop, at Sorel. I have no business to take those sheets with me. They don't belong to me.

Q. They belong to the government?—A. They belong to the government.

By Mr. Bureau:

Q. To whom do you deliver those loose sheets?—A. I deliver the loose sheets to Mr. Terreault.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. That is the assistant director?—A. He is supposed to be the assistant superintendent.

By Mr. Bureau:

Q. Do you do that every night? At the end of the week? Or at the end of the month?—A. The numbers which we receive to do the work, the order numbers, we deliver the sheet when the work is completed.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Have you delivered any of those to Mr. Terreault?—A. The sheets for that time have been delivered; as soon as I had finished with them, I was delivering them to Mr. Terreault.

Q. Would the names of those people mentioned in Exhibit 2 be contained in those sheets—those that you have delivered to Mr. Terreault?

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to question.

—A. They should be.

Q. And the place where they were working is mentioned?—A. The places are mentioned.

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to evidence until sheets are produced.

The Committee rose.

3.30 o'clock, p.m.

ARTHUR LAVALLÉE, sworn.

Examined by Mr. McDUGALL, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Lavallee, are you in the employ of the Marine and Fisheries Department, in Sorel?—A. I am, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. In what capacity?—A. I am employed in the painting department at the shops.

Q. Are you employed in the same department where Jean Baptiste Pagé is the foreman?—A. I am, sir.

Q. What are your duties? What are you doing there?—A. I prepare the paint and it is delivered.

Q. Do you know Mr. Adelard Lanctot, the member for Richelieu?—A. I do.

Q. Do you keep books in your department?—A. No, sir. Mr. Pagé is the one who keeps the books.

Q. What is the book which is kept by Mr. Pagé?—A. They are the books where-in is entered the paint which is delivered in the course of the day, and on the fifteenth of the month these books are sent to the office—I, for the department, take note, from the morning till the evening, of what concerns the department, and these notes I give in the evening to Mr. Pagé before the day is ended—that is the notes of the paint which has been used in the course of the day for the government.

Q. And Mr. Pagé enters that into a book?—A. He puts that down upon a slate, and on the 15th of each month he enters that into his book—that is, twice a month.

Q. Have you a name for that book?—A. I do not know anything about that. I never work at Mr. Pagé's book; he has his office, and I am in the shop.

Q. You have not this book with you?—A. No, sir. I only take the notes from the morning to the evening, and these notes I give to Mr. Pagé in the evening.

Q. Do you know that during the months of June, July, August, September, October and November, 1910, certain paint and material were supplied and delivered to Mr. Adelard Lanctot for the painting of his house on George street in Sorel?—A. I know that during the summer—I could not mention the months—there has been paint which was carried to Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. Could you give us an idea of the months during which this paint and material were supplied?—A. I did not notice it.

Q. Did you keep an account of the material so supplied?—A. No, sir; not one note.

Q. Who kept the account of the paint and other things which were carried to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé did.

Q. Did you ever see any book on which this account should have been kept?—A. No, sir.

Q. At the end of each fortnight, when Mr. Pagé has made his entries, what does he do with his book?—A. He sends it to the office.

Q. To which office?—A. I think it is in the office of Mr. Latraverse.

Q. Ulric Latraverse?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you see men during the summer—and if you can mention months, mention them—obtain paint in your shop to carry it to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir. I had knowledge that some painters carried some paint to Mr. Lanctot's house but I cannot mention any month.

Q. Can you give us the names of the painters who so obtained some paint?—A. There are Omer Pagé and Henri Paul who carried paint to Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. How many times?—A. I cannot say.

Q. Once only, or several times?—A. Some times.

Q. More than once?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When this material was carried, was it measured, counted or weighed in your presence?—A. I had knowledge that some of it was weighed—the first colour, the grey, for the priming.

Q. At what time was that?—A. During the summer. It was the first paint that went out of the shop.

Q. Is there any paint which went out of your shop in July?—A. That may be, sir, I tell you that I did not keep the time.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. To the best of your knowledge, in the month of July, was there any paint delivered at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. That is more than I can say.

Q. Who was preparing the parcels for Henri Paul and Omer Pagé?—A. I and Henri Paul. Henri Paul was working at the shop with me.

Q. Who prepared the parcels, you or him?—A. We were both working in the shop. Whoever was ready made up the parcels. Mr. Lanctot's house was not the only job. There were fifty or sixty painters to be served, for the yard. Mr. Pagé, himself, gave some.

Q. How did you keep account of the different places where you were sending these paints, if you had so many painters to serve?—A. The other painters were working for the department, and I told you that I take note of all the paint that goes out of the shop for the department, to go to the yard, in the fleet.

Q. For these paints you have a special number?—A. Yes.

Q. You have a special number for the invoice?—A. Each job has its special number.

Q. Had Mr. Lanctot's job a special number?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. You have no knowledge that a number has been attributed to Mr. Lanctot's job?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know what quantity of paint was delivered to Mr. Lanctot?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did Mr. Pagé, at any time in the month of July, August, September, October or November, give you instructions to deliver paint to any of his men to be carried to Mr. Lanctot's?—A. Yes, sir. He makes the colours himself, in part. They were special colours, and it was Mr. Pagé who made them in part.

Q. Did he make a requisition to Mr. Massé, the store-keeper, to have the paints he mixed in that way for Mr. Lanctot?—A. That is more than I can say.

Q. Now, these paints that you sent to Mr. Lanctot's, were they put into cans, in tins, in boxes, or how?—A. Sometimes they were put into gallon cans; at other times in pails which had been used to hold paint and which had been emptied.

Q. At what o'clock in the morning did Omer Pagé and Henri Paul leave to carry paint for Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. At the time of the whistle; at seven o'clock in the morning; some times a few minutes after that.

Q. And who crossed the river?—A. Themselves, Paul and Pagé, with their own skiff.

Q. Were other men working at Lanctot's? Did any government men cross over with them?—A. I do not remember, sir.

Q. Did you see other men besides Omer Pagé and Henri Paul helping Paul and Pagé to carry the paint?—A. Not to my knowledge. The other men who worked there all lived in Sorel. They were painters from Sorel.

Q. Were they not obliged to come to St. Joseph to punch?—A. They did not come.

Q. If they did not come, who punched for them?—A. It must have been the punch-keeper; I don't know.

Q. What was his name?—A. Gilbert Champagne.

Q. Apart from the paint, there has been putty and oil delivered, I suppose?—A. Yes, there must have been.

Q. I am not asking if there must have been some. From your own personal knowledge, was there any putty?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any paint brushes?—A. Loaned paint brushes; yes, sir.

Q. Brushes for painting?—A. Yes.

Q. Was there any steel wire for polishing?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Was there any pumice stone?—A. I think so. There was some, once.

Q. Can you give us an idea of the quantity of yellow paint, for instance, that was delivered?—A. No, sir.

Q. None at all?—A. No, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Green paint?—A. The same thing. It was Mr. Pagé who took the quantities of paint.

Q. In the month of December, on or about the 12th of December, did you receive the goods which are mentioned in Exhibit No. 13, which is now shown to you?

(Witness takes cognizance of Exhibit No. 13.)

A. Yes, sir, I received these quantities, and I signed that.

Q. Is the receipt written across this document in your own handwriting?—A. No, sir; I put my signature only, but the words 'Received the above goods' have not been written by me.

Q. Who brought you those goods?—A. Mr. Arthur Côté, the store-checker.

Q. The store-checker of Mr. Massé's store?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was done with those goods?—A. A part of them was used, and the rest is still in stock at the shop.

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot ever speak to you about those goods?—A. Never, sir.

Q. Did he ever come to the store when Jean Baptiste Pagé was there?—A. That may be.

Q. I am asking you whether you know or not?—A. It seems to me that he came once or twice last summer.

Q. Do you know why he came?—A. No, sir.

Q. He came to talk with Mr. Pagé?—A. No, sir; he came with visitors once; if I am not mistaken, he was with strangers.

Q. Did you ever see him speaking with Mr. Pagé about these paints?—A. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, declares that he has no cross-questions to put to the witness.

Witness discharged.

OSCAR CHAMPAGNE now appears, and being duly sworn deposes and says:—

OSCAR CHAMPAGNE, sworn.

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Champagne?—A. I live in Sorel.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am employed as time-keeper in the Marine Department.

Q. As checker or time-keeper of what men?—A. Of all the employees of the department.

Q. Does this include the painters who are under the direction of the foreman, Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. No, sir.

Q. In the course of the year 1910, in the summer, either in May or June, to begin with, did you meet Mr. Adélaré Lanctot, member for the county of Richelieu, with regard to the painting of a house belonging to Mr. Lanctot, and then being built?—Yes, sir.

Q. Will you tell us the circumstances under which you met Mr. Lanctot, and what happened between you?—A. Towards the end of May, 1910, Mr. Lanctot came to my office and told me that he had come to the department to see Mr. Papineau, in order to have some painters to go to his house and paint, but that Mr. Papineau was absent, and he asked me if I could do him that favour. I consented to do it. I told him I would send some men; that I would give Mr. Pagé instructions to send one or two men, according to the needs of the work.

Q. Mr. Pagé was present?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was Mr. Pagé seen at once, there in the next office or at the next door?—A. No, sir.

Q. You said you would give orders to Mr. Pagé to send men to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you give these orders to Mr. Pagé?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. When?—A. I do not know if it was a day or two after.

Q. Was it in the beginning of June, 1910?—A. I do not remember if it was on the 28th or 29th of May that Mr. Lanctot came. I know it was a day or two afterwards that Mr. Lanctot came.

Q. In the presence of Mr. Lanctot, you did not then see Mr. Pagé, and it was only two or three days afterwards that you saw him?—A. Two or three days afterwards.

Q. What orders did you give him?—A. I told Mr. Pagé to send one or two painters, or three painters to the house of Mr. Lanctot, as the work would need them.

Q. Do you know if he sent them?—A. Yes, sir, he sent them.

Q. How do you know it?—A. I know it because Mr. Pagé, every Saturday night, used to give me the time of the men whom he was sending to Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. You kept a memo or a record of the time which Mr. Pagé would send you every Saturday night?—A. I have kept those sheets.

Q. Where are they?—A. In my pocket.

The CHAIRMAN.—Are those the sheets showing the time of the men who worked at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. The time which Mr. Pagé gave me.

By Mr. Monk:

Q. What did you do with those sheets?—A. I have kept them.

Q. As you received them, did you do anything with them?—A. I would put them into a drawer.

Q. These entries have not been transferred into any other books of the Department?—A. They have been transferred; that is I made the account from those sheets.

Q. Were these entries transferred in turn as you received the sheets?—A. On the account?

Q. In the book of the department, or only at the end of the job?—A. I do not understand your question right.

Q. Those entries which you were receiving on Saturday, did you transmit them to the department, or did you only do it after the job was completed?—A. These were entered regularly every evening.

Q. To what employee did you give those entries?—A. To what employee?

Q. When you would hand them back to the department?—A. In speaking of these sheets?

Q. Yes.—A. I would keep them.

Q. To whom did you give the entry for the books of the department?—A. I did not give them to any one. This belonged to me.

Q. I thought I had understood from you that these entries were afterwards transferred to the books of the department?—A. No, sir, these sheets were given to me every Saturday night.

Q. Then, what did you do with them, Mr. Champagne?—A. I would put them into the drawer.

Q. Then, there were no entries made in the books of the department?—A. No, sir; there was none.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. It is from these sheets that you made the account which you sent later on to Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. So that, from the month of June to the month of November, it was not possible for Mr. Papineau, the director, or Mr. Terreault, the deputy director, to have knowledge, or to take knowledge of these notes which were in your drawer?—A. No, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. The pay is made every fortnight?—A. Every fortnight, on the 6th and the 21st; sometime it may be delayed or may be in advance one day.

Q. Have the men who are mentioned in your accounts been paid at each pay?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As if they had worked at the department's ship yard?—A. At the department, the same thing.

Q. And Désiré Champagne, the paymaster, did not know when he was paying these men, every fortnight, that they were working elsewhere than in the government shipyard, at the government's work?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever mention to Mr. Desiré Champagne the paymaster, that you were keeping accounts for work which was being done by government men at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. No, sir.

Q. During all the period from June to November?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why?—A. Because the paymaster has nothing to do with that.

Q. If I can judge from your evidence, I think I understand that you were the only one who knew about that?—A. At the time, yes—and then Pagé.

Q. Between you and Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. Yes.

Q. Are the notes actually in the same condition than when you have received them from Mr. Pagé?—A. They were not tied together. He gave them to me every week.

Q. Were the different sheets all signed by Mr. Pagé?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With those notes given by Mr. Pagé, have you prepared an account of the work done at the Lanctot house, and did you hand it to Mr. Lanctot? If so, have you got that account with you?—A. I made Mr. Lanctot's account with the sheets I had got from Mr. Pagé. After that I sent the account to Mr. Lanctot, in Ottawa.

Q. Then, I understand, it was yourself who prepared the account for work done by the men at Mr. Lanctot's, which has been sent by you to Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that account written in your own hand?—A. I would need to see it.

(Witness examines Exhibit No. 2.)

A. Yes, sir, that is mine.

Q. You had the details from Mr. Pagé to make up that account, so you have just told us?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had the exact dates in June and in the other months when the men have worked at Mr. Lanctot's, dates which had been communicated to you by Mr. Pagé. Why then, when you made the account sent to Mr. Lanctot, have you not specified the dates?

(Witness looks at Exhibit No. 2.)

A. I am satisfied with giving the month, with the number of days for each month for every man. I thought that would be sufficient.

Q. Will you look at the end of Exhibit No. 2, which you have there?—A. The account?

Q. Yes. You will see there the names of four labourers. I don't recollect at the moment those names. The four last items?—A. Yes.

Q. When did you get the details enabling you to show to Mr. Pagé the account for work done by those four labourers at the house in question?—A. It is a Mr. Joubert.

Q. Joubert, what is he doing?—A. Joubert, he is in Mr. Gendron's office.

Q. Alexandre Gendron?—A. Yes; the overseer of the labourers.

Q. How did you get that information?—A. By telephone.

Q. You were also the timekeeper for those men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But you didn't know when they had worked at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I knew it was in September.

Q. How do you know that? Did you give orders yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. To whom did you give the instructions?—A. To Mr. Joubert.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. What instructions did you give Mr. Joubert about that labourers' work?
—A. I telephoned to Mr. Joubert to send a man or two to Mr. Lanctot; and after that, when the men were coming back to the yard, Joubert used to telephone me that the men had returned to their work.

Q. What were those four labourers doing at Mr. Lanctot's in September?—A. I don't know.

Q. It was you who gave instructions to send them to their work?—A. It was me who sent them, but I have not followed them, and I don't know what they were doing.

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot himself ask you to send him labourers in September?—A. I don't recollect if it was Mr. Lanctot or somebody else. At all events, they have been sent for Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. I would like to know how it was that labourers had been sent to work, when Mr. Lanctot has only asked for painters?—A. He had asked for painters—he had asked some men.

Q. They wanted men as a whole to do some wood work and some painting?—A. Of course.

Q. Did you mean that at first?—A. The men for the wood work were not mentioned; only the painters.

Q. I thought they needed painters only but I see that there is some work done by day labourers; who asked you to send those day labourers?—A. I told you a moment ago that I did not remember if it was Mr. Lanctot or someone else. The fact is that those men have worked for Mr. Lanctot.

Q. It is also a fact that they have been paid by the government?—A. Yes, yes.

Q. You have no sheet where the name of those men are registered?—A. Not for those men.

Q. Those were called by telephone?—A. By telephone.

Q. Will you look at the date at the top of the account sent and compare them with the pay list I am going to show you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Looking over the pay list of the department beginning No. 144 and ending No. 155 included, are the names of some of the men mentioned in Exhibit No. 2 prepared by you figuring on the pay list and have been paid by the government?—A. They have been paid by the government.

Q. As you were keeping the time of those men on the dates mentioned there, where have those men worked on the other dates than those mentioned in Exhibit No. 2 and in Exhibit No. 24 you have produced to-day?

WITNESS.—The work?

COUNSEL.—Yes.

A. My department has nothing to do with the keeping of the time; I know nothing about it.

Q. Have you got something in your department, some books to show where those men worked in the government ship yards?—A. Not in my department.

Q. Did you, in your department, keep some books to register the time of the men, books called time books?—A. Here they are (showing the books referred to).

Q. Did you in that book entitled workingmen's time book entered or found names, of some men, mentioned in Exhibit No. 2 and in Exhibit No. 24?—A. They are mentioned in those books. They are in the books.

Q. Are those books in your own hand-writing?—A. Yes (looking over one of the books) no, not this one.

Q. In your book entitled 'workingmen's time book' you do insert the time of the men and you hand it to Desiré Champagne, the paymaster, who prepares the lists?
—A. I give the list ready to be paid, checked, the whole thing.

Q. You also prepare the pay list?—A. Myself.

Q. The pay lists are also from your own hand writing?—A. Some of them; those,
3—11½

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

you see, were written by Mr. Archambault who is in the office, he wrote them but I am responsible for Mr. Archambault's work.

Q. And the small book is in conformity with the pay list?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the bottom of each pay-list do you certify to the effect that the list made by you and prepared by you is correct?—A. Yes sir. Some times. I can forget it but at all events I am supposed to do it.

Q. I see some lists which are not signed?—A. Generally we sign the first and the last sheet. We do not sign every sheet.

Q. Look at the bottom of list No. 144, for instance, and see if———A. The pay master was the only one to sign; I forgot to sign it. The first sheet and the last one are signed by the two Champagne's. The first list is signed by me.

Q. Have you ever ordered Cuthbert Champagne, the man who looks after the punch, to punch the men who were working at Mr. Lanctot's even when they were not there to punch for themselves?—A. In the case of Mr. Lanctot, I do not remember if I, myself, gave the order to punch the cards or if Mr. Pagé did.

Q. Have you got some of those cards or some of those time tables of the punch? Have you got some here?—A. Yes, I have two months; November and December, 1910.

Q. You have some for the month of November?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But previous to November, going back to the month of July, have you got some of those cards?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where are they?—A. They are destroyed. We burn them every year, twice a year.

Q. But they are time records?—A. Yes, sir, but when a man has had his pay, at the end of two months, it is very seldom he makes any claim. And more than that, we have no place to keep those cards. We issue 22,000 every year.

Q. The cards for the month of November, we can examine them here?—A. They are here.

Q. When did you destroy the punch cards having reference to the work done at Mr. Lanctot's house previous to the month of November, 1910?

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question. *

Q. When did you destroy the cards of the men who worked in ship yards at Sorel for the government or anywhere else previous to the month of November, 1910, including the cards of those who worked at Mr. Lanctot's building?—A. The 11th of July. For once. We burn them twice a year. Once in the month of July and another time in the month of January, during the holidays.

Q. You made a fire to burn part of them in July; when did you destroy the rest?—A. In January, 1911.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. As usual?—A. As usual, every year.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Please show us one of those cards?

(Witness produces the cards mentioned).

Q. Please pick up, during the month of November, one of those cards, so as to show the Committee the nature of those cards.

(Witness shows one card.)

Q. You call that a punch?—A. We call that cards. The machine which marks those cards we call it a punch; but it is a clock.

Q. The time of the men is stamped on the card?—A. It is stamped on the card.

Q. It is not a hole you punch in the card?—A. The men put that card in a box placed there, they make a pedal work and the card is stamped.

Q. The date and the time are punched in the clock?—A. Yes.

Q. That is what you call punch?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Then, in the month of July you burned all the cards for the previous months, except however the month of May and the month of June?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in the month of January following you burned all the cards again, except those for the months of November and December?—A. Yes.

Q. Including those for the months of May and June?—A. Yes.

Q. You kept only the months of November and December?—A. Yes.

By the Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. In the month of July you burned the cards for the months of November and December, 1910?—A. Yes.

Q. And for January, February, March and April, 1910?—A. Yes.

A. Six months?—A. Six months.

Q. And you kept the two last months?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Why did you keep the two last months?—A. In case there would be some claims on the part of the men. Two months are too many, one would be enough.

Q. In the month of January, when you burned the cards, you burned them all, except November and December?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But in the month of January, some complaints were made, some affidavits were given, were they not, and you knew it?—A.

Q. You knew there was some trouble, that some affidavits and declarations had been made about the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I do not know if I thought of it then. At all events, that did not prevent me from burning them. I had orders to that effect and I followed them. I was ordered to burn them every year.

Q. What are these orders?—A. From whom did I get the orders?

Q. Yes.—A. From Mr. Desbarats.

Q. That is Mr. Papineau's predecessor?—A. Yes, sir.

By the Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. The men's time which is marked on these cards is then transferred in a book?—A. Yes, in one of the pass-books.

Q. In one of these pass-books which are before the Committee?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, if you have no claims from the men, then you have your books which determine whether the men have worked or not?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. If you had had any dispute in connection with the men's time, would you have kept more than the months of November and December?—A. If we had had trouble with the men?

Q. If you had had any, would you have kept more than two month's cards?—A. No.

Q. You would have burned them, in spite of all?—A. Of course. There is not a man who does not put in his claim within 24 hours, when there is any time short in his pay.

Q. Now, you have prepared the account, Exhibit No. 2, which you sent to Mr. Lanctot: Did you send it by mail?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Addressed to him?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where?—A. At Ottawa.

Q. You sent it to them by mail, addressed to Ottawa?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you go and see Mr. Papineau about this matter, and about the time you say that you sent the account to Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir, I think it was the next day that I spoke to Mr. Papineau about it.

Q. And on what day did you mail this account to Mr. Lanctot?—A. On the date on which the account was made.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. The 21st of November?—A. Yes.

Q. Was it you who wrote the date on the account?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, do you say it was on the next day, or the same day that you saw Mr. Papineau?—A. Not on the same day it must have been the next day or the day after.

Q. What did you say then to Mr. Papineau?—A. I asked Mr. Papineau, if there had been a letter from Mr. Lanctot.

Q. That was the first time that you mentioned to Mr. Papineau the work done at Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had Mr. Papineau received any news from Mr. Lanctot?—A. Not at the time, no. Not when I asked him.

Q. At that time, had the account for materials supplied for Mr. Lanctot's house, been prepared?—A. I don't know that, sir.

Q. Did you see Mr. Pagé about the account for materials?—A. No, sir.

Q. When you asked Mr. Papineau if he had any news from Mr. Lanctot, did he ask you why you wanted to know if he had had news from Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, he asked me why.

Q. Did you explain to him?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you tell him then?—A. I told Mr. Papineau that I had sent an account to Mr. Lanctot for the men he had had to work at his house.

Q. And then, what took place? . . . Is that all that took place between you?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to the question, inasmuch as what was said between Mr. Papineau and the witness, in the absence of Mr. Lanctot, cannot be admitted as evidence in the present investigation.

The objection is maintained by the chairman.

Q. Did Mr. Papineau ask you any information in order to ascertain whether the account was correct or not, and did he look at the books to verify whether it was correct or not?—A. No, sir.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Is it not true that, on the 28th or 29th of May, when Mr. Lanctot spoke to you for the first time about this job of painting, he said to you: 'I am in a great hurry, I am taking the train for Saranac Lake?'—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recollect that he added: 'Will you loan me men to work at my house' or other words to that effect?—A. I do not know whether these were his exact words, but it was something of that kind.

Q. Now, from the 24th of May until the 1st of November, you met Mr. Lanctot once in a while?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he speak to you about the account?—A. He asked me to make him his account, two or three times, four or five times.

Q. Do you remember at what time he asked you for his account in the first place? Was it in the month of June or in the month of July?—A. In the course of the month of June.

Q. What did you answer him?—A. I told him that I would make out his account when the job would be completed; that I was not going to make out accounts every week.

Q. Is it the same answer that you gave him when, on subsequent occasions, he asked you for his account?—A. Yes, sir; I always refused.

Q. Was there a price agreed upon, which the painters were to receive?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are we to understand that these painters were to receive the same salary that they were receiving in the department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Champagne, you mentioned the fact that on various occasions Mr. Lanctot asked you for his account; but apart from this, was there between you any talk about payment?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. What was said on that subject?—A. Mr. Lanctot, at different times, offered me money to pay the men who were working at his place.

Q. Did you accept?—A. No, sir.

Q. What did you answer him?—A. I answered him that I did not want the money, because I feared that the men would find fault. People might have thought that I received more than I gave. Therefore, the best way was to accept none at all.

By the Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. When you say 'people,' you refer to the workmen who were under your orders?—A. Oh, no. Those who were employed for Mr. Lanctot.

Q. Yes, yes; that is what I mean—people who worked?—A. Yes, yes; those whose time I checked.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Now, Mr. Champagne, there is something about this account which has perplexed Mr. McDougall. Will you explain how it comes that the last entries are dated in the month of September, while the entries immediately preceding are dated in the month of November and in the month of October?—A. That was because I did not want to put the labourers with the painters.

Q. Now, in your letter of the 21st of November, you inform Mr. Lanctot that if he desires to have information you would take pleasure in giving it to him. To what did you refer?

Mr. MCDUGALL, K.C., counsel for Mr. Blondin, objects to this motion, inasmuch as it is irregular, illegal and contrary to the rules on evidence, and does not arise from the examination in chief.

The Chairman allows the question.

A. Well, if he had thought that was too expensive, he could have told me about it. I was expecting that.

Q. You expected that?—A. Yes.

Q. And, not only were you expecting it, Mr. Witness, but the thing has happened. He told you that it was somewhat expensive, did he not?—A. Yes.

Q. When did he tell you that?—A. I think it was at the next trip he made at Sorel.

Q. What did he tell you about that?—A. He told me that his account was somewhat high. He had not thought that it would be as high as that.

Q. Now, as to the punch for the time of the men. In order that those men could have marked their time on cards, in the ordinary course, it would have been necessary for them to cross over at noon at St. Joseph, and afterwards to come back home?—A. Yes, and go across also at 1 o'clock.

Q. And also at 7 o'clock in the morning?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And also at 1 o'clock, after dinner?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And also at 6 o'clock in the evening?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, who is paying for those fares across? The department?—A. No, sir.

Q. We have been told that the department was paying the boatman?—A. He is the one who takes them across.

Q. What's his name?—A. The changes come so often. It is a man named Paul and one named Salvail who are the boatmen, one on each side of the river.

Q. Those men didn't give their time for nothing?—A. Not that I know. It would be pure folly on their part.

Q. They ask how much?—A. Three cents.

Q. For every trip?—A. For every trip—six cents go and return.

Q. So those people were saving eighteen cents every day?—A. Twenty-four cents.

Q. Was that not one of the reasons for which you have not forced those men to go across to register their time?—A. It was to exempt them to spend that money.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. And more particularly when you knew that Mr. Pagé could control the time of the men on the spot three times a day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, will you tell if Alfred Douaire has been absent from his work in July, 1910?

Mr. McDougall, K.C., counsel for Mr. Blondin, objects to question as not deriving from the examination in chief.

Question is allowed by the Chairman.

A. I would have to refer to the books in order to answer that.

Q. Could you verify that immediately, without losing too much time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I am told that he has been absent on July 26 and 27, 1910—one day on July 26 and half a day on July 27?

(Witness refers to book.)

A. Alfred Douaire has been away the whole day on the 26th and half a day on the 27th.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. What means this figure 'O'?—A. That means 'absent,' and an 'O' is entered also for Sundays.

Q. You verify those absences of Alfred Douaire from the pay-sheet No. 147, which is the pay-sheet for the two last weeks of July, from the 16th to the 31st—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Now, look at the list of August, and tell us if it is not true that Alfred Douaire has been absent from the 3rd to the 5th of August, 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not true, referring to your pay-sheet, that the same Alfred Douaire has been also absent from the 16th to the 20th of August, 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You are speaking from pay-sheets Nos. 148 and 149?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Now, will you look at the pay-sheets of September, and tell us if that same man has not been absent on September 6?—A. Yes, sir; he has been absent on September 3 and 4, 1910.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You are speaking from pay-sheet No. 150?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Has he been absent on any other working day of September, 1910?—A. He has been absent during half a day, on the 6th. On the two other days, which are marked with an 'O,' that was a holiday and a Sunday, and nobody has worked on those days.

Q. Now, will you look to see if he has not been away between September 7 and 30?—A. Yes, sir, three days.

Q. What are the dates?—A. September 28, 29 and 30.

Q. Now, see what there is in October. A. What date?
—Any date.

A. He has been away two half days.

Q. What date?—A. On the 6th and 7th.

Q. Is that all?—A. I don't know.

Q. Look a little further. A. Oct. 21, half a day.

Q. Now, Mr. Champagne, as to the papering which those men may have done at Mr. Lanctôt's, on King street, at the end of October, 1908, I am informed that Alfred

APPENDIX No. 3

Douaire was absent from his work on October 26, 27, 29, 30 and 31, 1908. Is that exact?—A. I would have to refer to the books.

Q. Have you got here your books for 1908?—A. No, sir.

Q. Will you verify that, and also for the first and second of November?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many of those cards do you use, during a period of twelve months, reckoning on the number of men you employ?—A. I have figured that up somewhat roughly, but I have found 22,000.

(The book containing the pay-sheets for the year 1908 is now brought and laid before witness).

Q. That man pretends that he worked for Mr. Lanctot on King Street, in the last days of October 1908; will you see if he has been absent at the end of October 1908, and if so, what are the dates?—A. On the 19th and 23rd; then there are three consecutive days but no body worked on those days.

Q. Never mind; give the dates?—A. On the 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th and 31st.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You speak from pay-list No. 105?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Now, what were the days on which all the men were absent?—A. The 25th 26th, and 27th.

Q. Now do you know where Douaire worked on the 29th, 30th and 31st of October, 1908? Do you know if he worked for Mr. Lanctot on those days?

Mr. MCDUGALL remarks that these questions are upon facts entirely new, which do not at all arise from the examination in chief, and he draws the attention of the Chairman to the fact that he will have to cross-examine the witness upon these facts.

The CHAIRMAN asserts that Mr. McDougall will have all due liberty to cross-examine the witness.

A. I cannot say.

Q. I am informed, Mr. Champagne, that you are very popular amongst your men at Sorel?—A. You are not hard to please.

Q. What is the position in that respect.

Mr. MCDUGALL, K.C., objects to this question as being useless.

Mr. LAFLAMME withdraws the question.

Q. Is there any one of the men who has worked for the department before, but is not working there any more, and who has been examined here as witness, who has passed derogatory remarks about you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To yourself?—A. To myself, yes.

Q. Who was that?—A. Andronique Sénécal, Herménégilde Lambert. I have not the list of the other witnesses; I do not know if I could find any more.

Q. Alfred Douaire?—A. Alfred Douaire, no.

Q. Nicholas Laroche?—A. No.

Q. Henri Proulx?—A. Henri Proulx also said his share.

Q. What did Lambert, Proulx and Sénécal say?—A. About Lambert, I would as soon lose the benefit of it and not repeat what he has said.

Q. What did he say, in exact terms? I tell you in advance that we will not believe it. A. I would not like to scandalize you.

Q. You will not scandalize us. A....

Q. Go on, go on. A. It is a hard thing to say that.

Q. Say it all the same. A. One day when Lambert was tipsy on his work—or in liquor, if you wish,—it was not the first time—I sent him to his home about four o'clock or half past four in the afternoon, as he was causing scandal amongst the

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

men by swearing. I thought that the department would be better off in paying him an hour and a half for nothing—I didn't desire to suppress his time—that in leaving him to bring scandal in this way upon every one, upon eight or nine hundred men.

Q. Did he say anything to you? Did he call you anything?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. What did he say. That is what I would like to know. A. It is not nice enough to be repeated.

Q. The more you will hesitate in saying what it is, the more we are anxious to know. A. At any rate he told me that even if it were after ten years, he would take his revenge against me.

Q. What did Proulx tell you?—A. About in the same terms, that he wanted to take his revenge.

Q. And Sénécal?—A. Sénécal, it is again the same thing. They all want a revenge.

Re-examined by Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Since Andronique Sénécal has given his evidence here has he been discharged from the employ of the government?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., of counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to the question as irrelevant to the purposes of this inquiry.

The question is allowed by the Chairman.

A. No, sir.

Q. Is he still in the employ of the department?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has he gone, then?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Gone of his own accord?—A. Yes, sir. He quit work the middle of the day without notifying anybody.

Q. When did this man make threats to you?—A. More than once a year. I do not take note of that, I have too much of it.

Q. That goes from year to year?—A. Yes.

Q. It is a good many years that he make threats against you so?—A. Not only he.

Q. I am speaking of Andronique Sénécal now, we will take the others afterwards?—A. Not before this year.

Q. He began this year to make threats?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you make any complaints to your superior officers?—A. No, sir. I would then be all the time with the superior officers.

Q. So you did not attach much importance to the threats of Andronique Sénécal?—A. The reason is I have these threats too often.

Q. It flows like water on a duck's back?—A. Not always.

Q. I am speaking of Andronique Sénécal?—A. Not always, he neither. There are times when it is hard to swallow.

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., of counsel for Mr. Lanctot objects to this evidence as being useless and irrelevant to the purposes of this inquiry.

The question is allowed by the Chairman.

Q. Did you attach any importance to these threats from Andronique Sénécal?—A. Not more than to the others.

Q. Did you attach any importance to that which you call threats from Lambert?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Lambert is the man who caused the great scandal at the government ship yards?—A. When he drinks.

Q. He raised the scandal when he was drunk?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you pay much attention to threats made by a drunkard?—A. Specially in the state Lambert was in, yes.

Q. In what extraordinary state was he in?—A. Because he was not dead drunk, he knew perfectly well what he was saying.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. You thought, however, that he was sufficiently drunk to dismiss him from the government ship yards?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he left?—A. Yes, sir. That is when he made some threats.

Q. When you dismissed him he made some threats?—A. Yes.

Q. When was that?—A. It must have been during the month of September, I think, the day we launched a dredge.

Q. He came back to work, however, and he kept working till the month of December?—A. Yes, sir, till the 28th or the 29th.

Q. Has he ever tried to carry out his threats?—A. He never tried because he knew he was not able to do it.

Q. You mean, I suppose, he was not big enough?—A. He was not big enough, no; he knew who he had to deal with.

Q. He knew it was better for him not to try?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. He thought it would be less dangerous to sign some affidavits than to get into a fight?—A. Yes.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Mr. Lanctot offered you some money on different occasions?—A. Yes.

Q. You would not accept it?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever mention that to Mr. Terreault or Mr. Papineau?—A. No, sir.

Q. Now, do you know something about the crossing, about what there is to be paid to go across the river?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does the government pay to have its men go across or do the men pay for themselves?—A. The government pays for part of them and the others have to pay themselves.

Q. Who are the ones the government pays for?—A. The office clerks, those who work in the store, the foremen and some sailors.

Q. Please look at the document now shown to you and tell us what it is supposed to be?

(Witness looks at the document.)

A. These are my initials.

Q. What is it?—A. It is a crossing ticket. That is good for three cents.

Q. That ticket is issued by the department?—A. Those are given by me.

Q. For the government, not for Oscar Champagne?—A. Of course, for the government.

Q. Those tickets are given under your initials to allow the men to cross over, it is good for one single trip?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who pays for those tickets, the men or the government?—A. The government.

Q. Have any of those tickets been given to the men who worked at Mr. Lanctot's house, either to the men who brought the paint over or to the men who worked at the house?—A. Never for the painting.

Q. Have any of the day labourers or any of the painters who worked at Adelard Lanctot's house received some tickets?—A. The painters, never.

Q. And the day labourers?—A. As for that I do not remember it.

Q. You cannot swear no positively?—A. Not more than yes.

Q. Now, when you speak of Alfred Douaire's absences, you do not speak from your own memory, you have been obliged to consult the pay lists?—A. Of course; since 1908 I have not got that in my memory.

Q. And we can have an idea of Alfred Douaire's absences and of his attendance to work by consulting the books?—A. Certainly.

Q. Do all the 'O' written on the pay lists mean Sundays or absences?—A. There are three or four in succession, they cannot be all Sundays.

Q. Can you discern a cipher you put for a man's absence from work from a

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

cipher you put for a Sunday, for instance?—A. A man who works cannot get a cipher; on Sunday he gets a cipher.

Q. There is no difference?—A. On Monday, if he does not work he gets another cipher.

Q. The cipher you put for a Sunday is exactly the same than the cipher you put for an absence?—A. Yes, sir, the ciphers are always alike.

Q. There is no difference between those applying to Sundays and those applying to days of absence?—A. No.

Q. When you speak of Alfred Douaire's absence, you mean his absence from the government's work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you figure out by the dates you gave us from the pay list as being days of absence, if he was away or if he was working at Lanctot's?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Devlin, M. P.:

Q. Mr. Champagne, you have noticed the days Alfred Douaire worked at Mr. Lanctot's, have you not, and you are positive about those days?—A. I could ascertain it every week, when I had the foreman's report.

Q. How long have you been in the position you occupy now, Mr. Champagne?—A. Seven years.

Q. Seven years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Before that time, Mr. Champagne, what was your occupation?—A. I was checker.

Q. Where?—A. At the department. I have been working fourteen years for the department.

By Mr. Barker, M. P.:

Q. It has been said to us here, Mr. Champagne, that the work done by the department was entered in the books so that the cost of each work could be ascertained?—A. No, not in my department.

Q. But those accounts were kept in some department, were they not?—A. Very likely, yes.

Q. When you entered the time of those different men who have worked at Mr. Lanctot's house since the month of June until the month of November, 1910, was there anything in the books to show which work those men had been working at?—A. No, sir.

Q. They were registered in the books as ordinary workingmen working for the department?—A. Yes, on the pay list.

Q. And that went on from June till November, 1910, during six months, 226 days and during that time you had no indication in the books to enable you to know where those men had been working, you had no record of it?—A. There was no record of it.

Witness discharged.

APPENDIX No. 3

THURSDAY, March 23, 1911

The Committee met at 10 a.m.

JEAN BAPTISTE PAGÉ recalled.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Mr. Pagé, yesterday you were requested to furnish a statement of the time of the men who worked at Mr. Lancot's; is that statement ready?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please show it to us?—A. Here it is.

(Witness hands the statement over to Mr. McDougall.)

Q. Is the statement you produce now, which is marked Exhibit No. 25, a reproduction of the entries made in your little book produced here as Exhibit No. 23?—A. It is exactly what is in the book.

Q. And that shows the days on which the men mentioned there have worked at Mr. Lancot's house?—A. Yes, sir, the dates and the places where they worked, also the kind of work they did.

By the Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Is it from that booklet you copied the account produced yesterday by Mr. Champagne, Exhibit No. 24?—A. The account was made from those figures (Exhibit No. 24).

Q. The statement you produced now, Exhibit No. 25, has been taken from your book?—A. Yes.

Q. From the book No. 23?—A. Yes.

Q. And what you have just produced is the same thing as that?—A. What I produced, Mr. Minister, is a copy of my book.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. In that statement you produced as Exhibit No. 25, there is, at the bottom of some of sheets, some entries or notes written with a pencil?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do those entries or those notes written with a pencil mean?—A. It is to show the work they did. I marked that with a lead pencil.

Q. The work they did at Mr. Lancot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You mean that from your memory, yesterday or this morning?—A. I made it from my book.

Q. Please show us in your books the places where you found this information?—A. They are the places where each has worked.

Q. But you now speak of memory, of things as far back as the month of June last?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What I am asking you is this: Those notes written with a lead pencil you put at the bottom of the sheets are not included in the book?—A. No.

Q. Then, you wrote those notes with a pencil, from your memory, going back as far as the month of June last?—A. My memory is good, Mr. McDougall.

Q. I notice it, because there are many details. Now, when you delivered the paint, the entry was first made on a slate, was it not?—A. For everything concerning Mr. Lancot the entry was made on a little rough copy.

Q. Were you not entering it on a slate?—A. The government's paint was entered on a slate.

Q. Then you were the only one to know the quantity of paint sent to Mr. Lancot's house and that quantity was marked on a rough copy you cannot produce?—A. Myself and my assistant. That rough copy I looked for it but I could not find it.

Q. Then you made up the account for that paint only after the work was done?—A. Yes, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. And the rough copy was lost at the time you made up the account?—A. At the time I made up the account, the rough copy was not lost. It is when looking for some other papers, I suppose, that it was mislaid. I am not the only one going into my office.

Q. Do you mean that somebody else might have taken those rough copies and destroyed them?—A. They can have mislaid them when looking for some papers. My assistant is often in my office; then my son comes often and looks for some papers. The fact is that I could not find it.

Q. Arthur Lavallee is your assistant?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He told us yesterday that all the entries had been made on the slate, for the paint going out of the shop?—A. The government's paint is entered on the slate.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Say, Mr. Pagé, all the paint is in the store, is it not?—A. Yes, Mr. Minister.

Q. Have you also a stock in your possession—in your possession, your own, apart of what is in the store?—A. We send an order for more than we have to prepare, because we prepare the paint sometimes twice during the same day—one thousand pounds, fifteen hundred pounds.

Q. You take a certain quantity of paint out of the store?—A. Sometimes we take out 2,000 pounds, sometimes 4,000 pounds; all that depends.

Q. And that is entirely under your control?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it was some of that paint, which was under your control, you took to send to Mr. Lanctot's?—A. It is some of that paint which was lent to Mr. Lanctot.

By the Chairman:

Q. Do you say positively that no paint was taken to Mr. Lanctot's house except what has been sent back to the ship yards by Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir, that only.

Witness discharged.

NAPOLÉON BADEAU, called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Badeau?—A. In Sorel.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Ship builder.

Q. Are you in the employ of the Department of Marine and Fisheries?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been working for the department?—A. 43 years.

Q. In which capacity are you employed by the department? What kind of work do you do for the government?—A. I am a kind of superintendent of my work.

Q. Foreman of the carpenters?—A. I beg your pardon, sir, I am considered as superintendent for the woodwork of the building.

Q. You know that Mr. Lanctot was building a house on George street, in Sorel, in 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot go to see you in order to get some men from you?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question on the ground it is not relevant to the charge which is the object of the present inquiry.

Objections sustained by the chairman.

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot go to see you and ask you to send some of your men who were working for the government, to work at his house and did you reply to him

APPENDIX No. 3

that you would send some men only when Mr. Papineau would order him to do so, and did these men go there?

Mr. LAFLAMME objects to that question on the ground it is illegal.

Question allowed by the chairman.

WITNESS.—You ask me?

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot go to see you and ask you for some men and did you reply to him that you would send them if Mr. Papineau was willing and did Mr. Papineau give his consent and did you send them?—A. Mr. Lanctot asked me if I had what was needed for what he was asking me. I told him that I had not got it at the time, but that it was easy to prepare it. Then, I told him that if he wanted to have what he was asking for, he had to ask it first to Mr. Papineau.

By Hon. Mr. Bureau:

Q. Did you send some men on that occasion to Mr. ————?—A. I beg your pardon, it was previous to that time or later. I sent men, the men were paid by Mr. Lanctot because I had warned the men not to punch before leaving. I ordered the man who had charge of the punch not to punch their cards.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. What did he ask you to send?—A. He asked me first to send some wood—

Q. Proceed with your answer. What did he ask you to send first?—A. He asked me to send some wood. I told him that to send some wood he would have to get an authorization from Mr. Papineau.

Q. Did he get an authorization from Mr. Papineau, and did you send some wood?—A. That is the last I heard of it.

Q. How long after that did you send some men?—A. The men who were around about the time.

Witness discharged.

JOSEPH BADEAU called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. What is your occupation and where do you live?—A. I live in Sorel.

Q. What do you do?—A. I design the boats to their required size.

Q. You are in the employ of the Marine Department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know Mr. Lanctot, the member?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you aware of the fact that in 1910 he was building a house on George street in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know a man named Osias Lachapelle?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is his occupation?—A. He works in the mill; he is the sawyer in the sawmill.

Q. He is the boss of the sawmill?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For the government?—A. Yes, yes.

Q. Did Mr. Lachapelle, to your knowledge, send some wood to Mr. Lanctot's house whilst Mr. Lanctot's house was being built in 1910?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see some wood going into Mr. Lanctot's whilst the house was being built?—A. No, sir.

Witness discharged.

J. A. PROULX called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You are the ticket agent at Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

By the Chairman:

Q. Ticket agent of what?—A. The railroad.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Are you the uncle of Henri Proulx?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the course of the month of June last, along towards the 6th, that is the Feast of Epiphany, were you present at an interview between Adelard Lanctot and your nephew?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you relate what took place at that interview?—A. My brother Napoleon was at my office, and he said he would like that our nephew, Mr. Henri Proulx, would get back his job from the government, and he, my brother, especially, was working pretty hard to have Henri get back his job.

Q. You mean your nephew?—A. Yes. He was without work. They dismissed him, so he came to my office and said we ought to do something for our nephew, and I guess he had an interview with Mr. Lanctot before.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU.—That is nothing.

Mr. LAFLAMME.—That has been proved by Proulx himself.

The WITNESS.—Well, we went to Mr. Lanctot's house, and my brother sent a boy that he met on the street to get Henri to come to Mr. Lanctot's bureau—his office. So Henri came in there, and I was there with my brother Napoleon, and we, especially my brother, got Mr. Lanctot to try and do something for Henri. So Mr. Lanctot says that he could not do much or anything for Henri because he had this charge against him you know.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. What charge do you mean?—A. He had a declaration, you know. You know what it is.

Q. An affidavit, a solemn declaration. You know I am just asking?—A. Well, he made a kind of statement that Mr. Lanctot had painters from the shipyard.

Q. To work at his house?—A. Yes. So when we got to the subject in Mr. Lanctot's office, Mr. Lanctot says he could not do much or anything for Henri, 'I cannot do anything for you on account of this declaration you made, and it is wrong.' He told Mr. Proulx it is wrong, and if you know it now is the time to say it is wrong. You understand, he says it is the time to say it is wrong if it is wrong.

Q. Mr. Lanctot said to your nephew, Henri?—A. Yes, 'If it is wrong you sign this paper.' I did not know the contents of it. All I says—

Q. What did you understand the paper to be?

The CHAIRMAN.—Not what he understood it to be.

WITNESS.—He said, 'If you sign this paper, if you think the declaration you made is wrong, unless, of course, you believe that the declaration was wrong, and if you do so, well, we will try to do something for you.'

Q. He would try to do something for you?—A. Yes.

Q. And what you and your nephew were applying for was to be reinstated in your job?—A. Surely.

Q. What further occurred?—A. Not much of anything else that I know of. Henri said that he would not sign it.

Q. He would not sign it; why?—A. He said he would not sign it as he believed the declaration he made was right.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Was right?—A. Yes.

Q. Did Henri, your nephew, read the paper which Mr. Lanctot offered him to sign?—A. I believe he did.

Q. Did you say anything to Mr. Lanctot in presence of your nephew?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you say?—A. I do not know it had anything to do with this case.

The CHAIRMAN.—Then don't say it.

WITNESS.—I do not really think it had anything to do with this case.

The CHAIRMAN.—You have no reason to state anything but what is connected with this investigation.

WITNESS.—I do not say it is connected with this investigation.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. What did he say, what did he reply?—A. I have no objection to say—

Q. What did you say?—A. I said, 'Mr. Lanctot, some of the head men of the departments, of some of the departments, I say, well, I say they are damn fools.' You understand. I don't mean to say the chief of the department; I don't mean to say either the chief of the office, but it is the chief of some of the departments.

Q. Some of them were damn fools?—A. Yes, and I do believe it yet. I have not changed my mind.

Q. I suppose that remark would apply to the officers with whom Mr. Lanctot had dealt in the matter?—A. Some of them, yes.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. After Henri Proulx, your nephew, had refused to sign the paper submitted by Mr. Lanctot, didn't Mr. Lanctot suggest something to your nephew?—A. Not that I remember of. All he said is as I have told you.

Q. You need not repeat it. Didn't he suggest to Henri Proulx to write a letter himself?—A. Yes.

Q. To suit his own convenience?—A. Certainly, he said, 'Of course if it doesn't suit you you can write it yourself to where you want it to.'

Q. Yes; what did your nephew answer?—A. He says he would not sign it and he thought it was right, and he would not go back on what he had said and what he signed.

Q. So if it had not been for the interference of yourself and your brother Napoleon, that interview would not have taken place at all?—A. Very likely not. Of course I forgot to remark that Mr. Lanctot said it was for the sake of J. A. Proulx and Napoleon Proulx that he would have done it.

Q. J. A. Proulx was yourself, and Napoleon Proulx was the other uncle?—A. Yes.

Q. And he stated to your nephew that he would do that, not for his sake, but for your sake?—A. Yes, sir, for the sake of his uncles.

Q. Now you referred to certain charges which your nephew had made against them. Now, who were they?—A. I do not know.

Q. Well, there must have been more than one. You mentioned Mr. Lanctot; now, who were the others?—A. At this interview?

Q. Yes?—A. There was none.

Q. But who were the others referred to in the charge?—A. I do not know.

Q. You said in your examination-in-chief that Mr. Lanctot said you had made and your nephew had made a charge against them?—A. Yes.

Q. Who were 'they'?—A. It was Henri himself.

Q. He made the charges against whom?—A. Against Mr. Lanctot.

Q. And who else?—A. I do not say anybody else.

Q. Then you made a mistake when you said he referred to a charge against them. Who was the charge against—him?—A. Yes, against him.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. There was no mention of a foreman across the river at that interview?—

A. Not that I know of. No, it should be 'him' instead of 'them.'

Witness discharged.

The CHAIRMAN.—What other witnesses have you?

Mr. McDougall.—I would like to put one or two questions to Hon. Mr. Brodeur.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. As head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries did you receive any complaints, solemn declarations, containing complaints respecting the painting or work done at the house of Adélard Lanctot, the Member for Richelieu?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you state what complaints, at what dates you received them?—A. I can give you the dates if I had my papers with me. I will send for them.

Q. When you received these complaints, Mr. Brodeur, what did you do with them?—A. I referred them to Mr. Lanctot. I wrote a letter to Mr. Lanctot which I may produce.

Q. Enclosing?—A. Enclosing the complaints. I do not know whether I sent copies of the originals.

Q. Will you please produce the letters?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you receive any reply from Mr. Lanctot?—A. Yes, I got a reply from Mr. Lanctot sometime after, stating that as a question of fact he had the use of some painters from Sorel, but that he paid for them.

Q. Will you produce the reply?—A. Yes. Here is the letter which I sent to Mr. Lanctot. It has been handed to me by his lawyer.

Q. So long as you can identify it?

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. What is the date?—A. 5th December, 1910.

Letter filed as Exhibit '26.'

WITNESS reads letter in French and then translates as follows:—

Ottawa.

Mr. ADELARD LANCTOT, M.P.,

MY DEAR LANCTOT,—Mr. Lamoureux has just handed over to me declarations of a most important nature. It is alleged in those declarations that you have made use of the services of men who are employes of the government shipyard at Sorel, and that those men have been paid by the government. Besides, it is affirmed therein that you have secured from the departmental stores at Sorel some paint which has been utilized for your personal benefit.

Mr. Lamoureux, after having communicated to me those declarations, appeared to be slightly embarrassed, and would have liked to withdraw them, but I told him that these facts having been made known to me, I could do nothing else but institute an investigation into the facts alleged. I take the liberty of communicating them to you, and of asking you if the facts stated are true.

Yours truly,

L. P. BRODEUR.

Q. Have you another?—A. Here is a copy of the answer:—
Original filed as Exhibit '27.'

APPENDIX No. 3

Witness reads in French, and then translates, as follows:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

December 6, 1910.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR,

Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Mr. MINISTER,—I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date inclosing two documents entitled, 'Solemn Declarations,' respectively signed by Messrs. Alfred Douaire and Henri Proulx, two painters of the town of Sorel, who used to be employees of the Department of Marine and Fisheries as such, but were dismissed about the beginning of November last—consequently two dissatisfied men. Mr. Douaire states in his declaration that certain painters of the Department of Marine and Fisheries have worked at my house, and have been paid by said department. This is true; but as soon as their work was finished I reimbursed the department as per understanding with the officers. I did the same with regard to borrowed material. The whole was paid several days before the filing of those documents.

In order to let you see the spirit of Mr. Lamoureux, who has handed you those documents, I am sending you copy of a letter which I have received from him under date of the 23rd November, 1910. It is very likely it is because I have not allowed myself to be blackmailed that he tries to put up this little game.

If you wish any other explanations, I am ready to furnish them to you at any time.

Yours very truly,

ADELARD LANCTOT.

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. Have you that letter, the original?—A. Yes, I have the original. It will be here in a minute. I have sent for the documents.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Have you any other correspondence with Mr. Lanctot on the subject?—A. I do not know. I can tell you as soon as I get my papers.

Q. Did you correspond with the director of the works at Sorel, Mr. Papineau, or the assistant, Mr. Terreault?—A. No, I have seen Mr. Papineau.

Q. How long after you received the letter?—A. A short time after.

Q. Had the materials then been returned to the department when you saw him?—A. Oh, yes, he told me everything had been settled.

Q. You hadn't seen him before the settlement?—A. No, not before the settlement.

Examination of Mr. Brodeur suspended.

ULRIC LATRAVERSE recalled.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Will you look at the blank or form which is now shown you and say whether it is one of the forms used in the Department of cost price, to indicate the time of the men employed and the quantity of materials which have been supplied for a particular job?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., Counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to this question as being irrelevant to the present investigation.

The question is allowed by the Chairman.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

A. This is a sheet like those which are filled each day by the foreman, after the day's work. In that blank form the foreman shows the time of men, the material which have been used by him during the day and the number of the job on which that time and these materials have been utilized. Each work or job bears a number which is furnished by our Department. With regard to the materials, they are supplied on requisitions, but these requisitions must bear the same job number as that on which the men have worked.

Q. For the paints supplied for Mr. Lanctot's house and for the men who have worked on it, did you ever, in your Department receive from Jean-Baptiste Pagé or from Oscar Champagne any form like that which you now have before you?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., Counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question.

The question is allowed by the Chairman.

A. No, sir; nothing ever came. As I said the other day in my deposition, no job number ever went out of my Department for the work done at Mr. Lanctot's; so that I had nothing to report upon.

Q. You can not say whether any job number was ever attributed to Mr. Lanctot's work?

The Chairman directs Mr. McDougall's attention to the fact that the witness has already established the fact mentioned in the question.

Mr. McDUGALL withdraws his question.

Witness discharged.

CUTHBERT CHAMPAGNE called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. What is your occupation, Mr. Champagne?—A. I am a carpenter, sir.

Q. Are you employed in the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Sorel?—

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the nature of your work?—A. I work at carpentering and I keep a punch to have the men punch their time.

Q. The men who are working?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you take cognizance of the list of names, exhibit No. 2, and say whether you know these men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As keeper of the punch, can you say that they punched with the instrument of which you are the keeper?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you receive from Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé or Mr. Oscar Champagne, instruction to punch for these men or some of these men, whether they were present or not punch for themselves?—A. I received instructions from Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé to punch for certain men who worked outside of the yard.

Q. Can you name certain of the men who are on this list you hold in your hand, and for whom Jean Baptiste Pagé told you to punch, men who work outside of the government's yard?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Name them?—A. Octavien Lafreniere, Alberic Letendre, Omer Pagé. . . Well, Omer Pagé, punched for himself, he lived at St. Joseph. He came to St. Joseph for his meals and he punched for himself.

Q. And who are the others for whom Jean Baptiste Page told you to punch?—A. Adelard Letendre, Theodore Emond, Alfred Douaire, Arthur Trempe, Arsene Ally, Edmond Brault and Louis Paul.

Q. Did you follow instructions? Did you punch?—A. I punched for them, yes, sir.

Q. You marked them as though they punched for themselves?—A. Yes, sir, I did as he told me to do.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Did Oscar Champagne tell you the same thing?—A. I had two classes of men, I had some for Mr. Oscar Champagne and I had some for Mr. Pagé, at the same punch.

Q. Did Oscar Champagne give you the same instructions?—A. No, he did not give me instructions to punch the cards of those who went outside of the yard.

Q. Who are the men to whom you refer as coming from Oscar Champagne?

The CHAIRMAN says that that question is useless.

Mr. McDougall does not press that question.

Q. Are the four individuals whose names appear at the bottom of the list, the four last names on the list, are they those whom you say were under Mr. Oscar Champagne?—A. I do not recollect having punched for these.

Q. Mention the names of certain men who were under Mr. Champagne and who worked at the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. It is very difficult; there were several.

Q. Are they mentioned on the account exhibit No. 2?—A. Sir, I do not know these, but Mr. Champagne told me to punch the cards which were in the punch for these people.

Q. Then, have you punched for them without knowing who they were and without being able to name them now?—A. I have not kept count of anything, sir; but all the cards I punched, I received instructions to punch them.

Q. I mean only the men who worked at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Well, I named them a while ago.

Q. For whom did Mr. Champagne tell you to punch—for men coming from him and working at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I do not quite understand your question.

Q. You said that you had two classes of men, a certain number worked under Oscar Champagne and a certain number came from Jean-Baptiste Page?—A. Yes.

Q. Who worked at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes.

Q. I now wish to know who are those for whom Mr. Oscar Champagne told you to punch, whether they were present or not—men who worked at Lanctot's?—A. I do not remember that. There were several to punch. Before punching for Mr. Pagé, I punched all the cards under Mr. Champagne's orders.

Q. Do you see any which Mr. Champagne asked to punch, on that list you now have before you?—A. There may be some, sir, but I can not see.

Q. You can not remember if there is any?—A. No, sir.

Q. You state that there were others than those who are on this list, exhibit No. 2, for whom you punched at the request of Oscar Champagne, men who worked at Lanctot's?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question as being illegal, inasmuch as the question is affirmative of a fact which has not been proven by the witness.

Mr. McDougall withdraws his question.

Q. Did you state that there were others than those for whom you punched at Oscar Champagne's request, people who worked at Lanctot's?—A. No, no. They were men who worked in the yard.

Q. You do not know whether they worked at Lanctot's or not?—A. I did not see them, sir, nor did I follow them. I did not inquire about that.

Witness discharged.

HENRI AUGUSTE TERREAULT, called, sworn and examined:

By Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. You are assistant director of the Marine and Fisheries Department's shipyard in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under Mr. Papineau?—A. Yes, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. From June to about the end of November, 1910, did you have any official knowledge that certain men in the employ of the government had been sent to help building up Mr. Lanctot's house, on George street, in the city of Sorel, and that certain materials had been supplied by the Marine Department for the construction of that house?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you had any knowledge of the supply of these materials and of the work of those men for the construction of Mr. Lanctot's house, in the name of Mr. Lanctot, at any time in 1910?—A. No, sir.

Q. When did you get that information for the first time?—A. After there had been a talk that a cheque had been sent in payment.

Q. Then, the first intimation you had of that transaction with Lanctot was when you heard something said about a cheque?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see the cheque?—A. No, sir.

Q. Tell us in what circumstances you heard for the first time of what had been going on with regard to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I cannot very well remember how it happened. I think it was in my office. Mr. Papineau was conversing with another officer; I don't remember what officer it was.

By the Chairman:

Q. How did you hear about the cheque?—A. Because they were speaking about that cheque.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Have you seen the cheque?—A. No, sir.

Q. At what date was that?—A. I don't remember exactly.

Q. Was it in December, 1910?—A. It must have been about the middle of November.

Q. At the end of November?—A. I don't remember, sir.

Q. Well, you only heard about it because you overheard a conversation?—A. Yes.

Q. Personally, how did you have knowledge of the Lanctot transaction? What personal knowledge have you of the transaction?—A. I have none, sir.

Q. When do you receive, at your department, the sheets containing the nature of the work, the time of the men, the quality, the quantity, etc., with the prices and the number of the contract?—A. All that comes in my department is the order number issued to a department's foreman, and which is returned to me in order that I may know when a part of the job is completed, so that I can send a new order to another department.

Q. It's your own department, that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For instance, you receive from Mr. Ulric Latraverse's department, that is the Cost Department, records or files or sheets on which are registered the number of the job, etc.?—A. I have a special form in my office for the insertion of an order number for a determined work.

Q. When you say 'order number,' can that be called also in English 'job number'?—A. Job number, yes, that is it.

Q. Does the form I am now showing you, and which is Exhibit No. 28, correspond with the form of which you speak?—A. No, sir.

Q. Will you tell us what is the form that I am showing you now, Exhibit No. 28?—A. It is the form sent in by the foremen to the Cost Department for the distribution of the time of the men on the different works.

Q. Will you describe to us the form used in your department for the job number, etc.?—A. My form has no relation to that one, sir.

Q. I ask you to describe to us the form which you use?

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you any of those forms here?—A. No, sir; but the thing is very simple. This is what there is on them:

APPENDIX No. 3

'Please send a job number to.....(such a department).....to do..... (such a work).....'

And that is all.

The form simply says: Please send a job number to a determined department, to do such a work.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. And you send that book to whom?—A. To the Cost Department, where they put the job number asked for.

Q. Nothing of the kind has been done in the case of Mr. Lanctot's work?—A. No, sir.

Q. After you had heard about the cheque, did you try to get any information to know the nature of Mr. Lanctot's transactions?—A. No, sir, because Mr. Papineau was in charge of it.

Witness discharged.

ARTHUR CAYER, called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. You live in Sorel, Mr. Cayer?—A. St. Joseph-de-Sorel.

Q. Are you in the employ of the Department of Marine and Fisheries?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Since when?—A. Since four years—it will be four years in the spring.

Q. What do you do there?—A. I am a labourer.

Q. Do you know Mr. Adelard Lanctot, the member for Richelieu?—A. I know him as member of parliament, yes, sir.

Q. Are you aware that he was having a house built in 1910, on George street, in the city of Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know that Mr. Lanctot has moved from one house to another?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you help him in that moving?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., Counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question as being irregular and illegal and irrelevant to the accusation which is the object of the present inquest.

Mr. McDUGALL, Counsel for Mr. Blondin, declares that he offers that evidence, believing it to be of such a nature that it could throw light on the subject of the inquest.

The Chairman overrules the question as irrelevant to the accusations which is the object of the present inquiry, and he refuses to accept said evidence.

Witness discharged.

NORMAN MASSÉ, called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Your name is Norman Massé?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you in the employ of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As store-keeper?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the nature of that employ?—A. My duties are to see that the stock is always in good order, and to supply the store.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Do you receive requisitions for paints needed for different works of the government?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever receive a requisition for paint and material to be furnished for the painting of Mr. Adelard Lanctot's house?—A. Never, sir.

Q. From June to November, 1910, did you ever know anything about the paint which was furnished for the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Nothing, during that interval, until November.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Naturally, after delivering the goods upon a requisition presented to you and taking a receipt for those goods, your mission is filled and you have nothing more to do?—A. Yes, sir. When once a foreman has made a requisition, and I have got a receipt from him for the goods delivered, that is all I have to do.

Q. You have no business to know in what way the paint is being used?—A. No, sir.

Q. There is then nothing strange in the fact that you were aware that some paint had been sent to Mr. Lanctot?—A. No, not at all.

Q. That is none at all of your business?—A. Not at all of my business.

Re-examined by Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. When you receive a requisition, is the job number on it?—A. When I receive a requisition for the fleet I do not need a job number. Suppose I receive a requisition for such a dredge or tug, I do not need a job number, because it is known that the material required is to be used for that tug or dredge in particular. Now, suppose that Mr. Pagé comes with a requisition for 2,000 pounds of white paint; it is understood that is to be charged to the paint shop, and the distribution of it is none of my affair.

Q. The distribution is made at the shop and the job number is given at the shop?—A. I have nothing to do with the job number which is given at the shop.

Witness discharged.

HENRI AUGUSTE TERREAU, recalled.

By J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Will you look at these numbers which appear on Exhibit No. 19, which is now shown to you, and state of what handwriting they are?—A. I don't know.

Q. Is that in your handwriting?—A. No, sir.

Q. Will you look at the initial and figures 'J 399' written across the face of the document and state if you know what that means?—A. No sir. I don't know.

Q. And the letters 'R E F D.' Jan. 12th, '11,' do you know what that is?—A. No, Sir.

Q. Is the names of Octavien Lafrenière, or other painters, shown on that list?—A. No.

Q. Do you know who keeps these sheets?—A. I think they are kept by the cost department.

Witness discharged.

ULRIC LATRAVERSE, recalled.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall:

Q. Will you look at exhibit No. 29 and say if this has been prepared at your department and if you know the handwriting?

(Witness examines the document.)

A. I don't know that handwriting.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. You have not prepared that document yourself?—A. No sir.

Q. Do you know who wrote the letter and figures 'J 397' which appear in red pencil across the face of any of these sheets?—A. No sir.

Q. You don't know what that means?—A. No sir.

Witness discharged.

L. GUSTAVE PAPINEAU, recalled.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Can you tell us what officer in your department prepared the paper now shown to you and forming part of exhibit No. 29?—A. I could not tell you; I was not aware of it.

Q. You cannot tell?—A. No.

Q. Do you know the initial 'J 399' and what that refers to, which appears on these different slips?—A. It may refer to a page in a book.

Q. It may refer to a job number too?—A. I don't know.

Q. Have you got a journal in your department, and is your journal here?—A. We have a book here which I think is a journal.

Q. Will you please refer to that book and verify if this 'J 397' refers to a page of the journal?

(The witness refers to the book in question.)

A. This refers to page 397 of the journal.

Q. That 'J 397' which appears on the face of exhibit 29, is a reference to page 397 of a book?—A. Of a book, yes.

Q. A government book?—A. Yes.

Q. What book is it; how do you call it?—A. It is a journal.

Q. You find an entry in that journal under date November?—A. Yes.

Q. What is that entry?—A. At page 397 I find the following entry.

November, 1910.

A. Lanctot, Dt. \$375 62

The ship yard pay rolls:

June 1 to 15.. . . .	\$12 00
" 16 to 30.. . . .	20 00
July 1 to 15.. . . .	28 40
August 1 to 15.. . . .	36 05
" 6 to 31.. . . .	8 50
September 16 to 30.. . . .	82 42
October 1 to 15.. . . .	83 90
" 16 to 31.. . . .	50 15
November 1 to 15.. . . .	44 98
" 16 to 30.. . . .	9 32

Labour supplied to A. Lanctot as per account rendered and certified by C. Champagne, timekeeper.

Q. Now, Mr. Papineau by that entry of November, 1910, at page 397 of the journal, do I understand that the amount of the cheque for \$375.62 which came from Mr. Lanctot was charged up to the different pay rolls from June to November, as stated on that page 397?—A. It is a reimbursement.

Q. The reimbursement is charged up to different pay-rolls?—A. That shows where the reimbursement applies.

Q. When was that page of the journal made up?—A. I have no means of knowing.

Q. What hand writing is that? Who keeps that book?—A. That is kept by Mr. Baril.

Q. By Baril, the accountant?—A. Yes.

Q. Is exhibit No. 29 a copy of the different men's time, not a copy of the entry

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

made at page 397 of the Journal in the month of November?—A. Exhibit 29 is a summary showing the time given at each pay-list from June to November.

Q. With the men's names at the detail of the men's labor?—A. When I say it is a summary I refer to the first page. The second page is the account, and the rest is probably the distribution showing what the account was for.

Q. That is not the entry which is made at page 397 of the Journal?

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., objects to this question as useless and irrelevant.

The question is withdrawn.

Q. Can you tell us at what date these entries were made? They could be made only after you received the cheque?—A. Yes.

Q. And the cheque was sent on the 22nd or 23rd of November?—A. Yes.

Q. And you acknowledged it on the 2nd December?—A. Yes.

Q. So that the entry at page 397 of the Journal could only have been made after you received that cheque?—A. Yes.

Q. And therefore after the 23rd of November?—A. Yes.

Q. And therefore it was after the 23rd of November 1910 that you apportioned back to each of the different pay-rolls from July to November the amount appertaining to them, so as to make up the amount of the cheque?—A. We could not do it before having had the account.

Cross-examined by Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Of course, you notice, Mr. Papineau, that the preceding entry, at page 396, is the following: "Fuel account, Dr. to Cost Ledger \$10.00" and the subsequent entry, after the Lanctot entry, is what?

(Reading from the book).

"Sundry refunds Dr."

Mr. McDougall, K.C., of counsel for Mr. Blondin, objects to this question as not arising out of the examination in chief.

The question is allowed by the President.

Q. You notice that the entry immediately following the Lanctot entry at page 397 is an entry for what?—A. It is for sundries. It covers different things supplied to the steamer Montmagny, the steamer Verchères, etc.

Q. So that the entry relating to Mr. Lanctot appears by the book to have been made in the regular course, as the transactions are brought to the knowledge of the bookkeeper?—A. Yes, sir.

Re-Examined by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.,

Q. Do you say that it is the usual course when a cheque for \$375 is received at the department on the 23rd of November 1910, to have to go back through all the pay-rolls from June right down to November in order to distribute, or charge up, or account for the amount of the cheque? Is that usual?—A. The charges have to be made according to what we have in hand.

Q. Therefore, in order to distribute the amount of that cheque you had to have some officer to go back to all the pay-rolls from June to November?—A. We have to mention the months.

Q. You had to go back to every one of the pay-rolls?—A. Certainly.

By Mr. Barker, M.P.:

Q. Are you a bookkeeper?—A. No, sir.

Q. You know enough about book-keeping to know that entries made in a journal are taken from other books, do you?—A. Yes.

Q. From a day-book?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell us what day-book that entry was taken from?—A. No.

Q. Are there such books?—A. Yes.

APPENDIX No. 3

The examination of Hon. Mr. Brodeur resumed.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Will you now read the originals of the papers which you were requested to produce?—A. Yes. I have now got before me the originals of the declarations, which were put in my hands by Mr. Lamoureux. Those declarations were sent by Henri Proulx and Alfred Douaire. I now file the declaration of Alfred Douaire as Exhibit No. 30.

The CHAIRMAN. But the whole bundle of documents in as Exhibit No. 30.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Then I file these papers as Exhibit No. 30.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Exhibit No. 30 then is composed of the two affidavits?—A. Exhibit No. 30 is composed of the complaints which have been made by Proulx and Douaire.

Q. Bearing what date?—A. They bear the date of 30th November, 1910.

Q. Both of them?—A. Yes, both of them. They must have been handed to me—

Q. The next item of Exhibit 30 is what?—A. The next item is a letter from me to Mr. Lanctot (exhibit No. 26.)

The CHAIRMAN.—That is already in.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Oh, you have a copy of it.

The CLERK.—Yes, we have a copy.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Is that the letter of the 4th of December?—A. The letter of the 5th December, 1910, asking for explanations from Mr. Lanctot. Immediately after the receipt of those declarations I thought it was my duty to have the matter investigated and I immediately communicated with Mr. Lanctot. I see from the original, which has been produced, that the word 'personal' was put in, but when I came to send the letter I struck out the word 'personal' because I did not consider this matter a personal matter. The next letter I have got is a letter from Mr. Lanctot in answer to the request I made to him. I have already indicated to the Committee the nature of the letter. (Reads)

In order to let you see the spirit of Mr. Lamoureux who has handed to you those documents, I am sending you a copy of a letter which I have received from him under date of the 23rd November, 1910. It is very likely it is because I have not allowed myself to be blackmailed that he tries to put up this little game.'

Here is the letter to which he refers: It is a letter dated Sorel, 23rd November, 1910, and addressed to 'Adelard Lanctot, Esq., Member for County of Richelieu, House of Commons, Ottawa.' (reads):

My dear Adelard:—

What news will you bring me Saturday? You will have seen the Minister I suppose. I count on your bringing me a favourable reply.

If the Minister refuses to grant me what I ask of him, after having made promises to me, and having heard what he has said to me; if he refuses, I say, I declare to you, my dear Lanctot, that I will be obliged to attack strongly, and to bring to light things about which I feel reluctant; my determination has reached its height, whatever may be the consequence.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Do your best, my dear Lanctot, because a refusal will certainly have grave consequences. You have enough in hand to make the Minister give in, if he keeps his word, and what he has written, as I have no doubt he will.

Truly yours,

J. O. LAMOUREUX.

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. Is that the Mr. Lamoureux that went to you?—A. Yes, the same man. After that Mr. Lamoureux telegraphed to me on 12th December (reads):—

I have some other things, more grave, more serious, than the writings that I have given to you. Will be in Ottawa this week.

On the 13th December he wrote me again stating that he had decided to come and see me on the 15th or 16th instant. I will here read this letter. (Reads):—

At the request, Mr. Minister, of several citizens, I have decided to go and see you on the 15th or 16th instant.

The object of my trip will be to see you in the interests of the party.

This decision is taken by a great number of citizens who met in committee in my office after having been made aware of the bad turn of the affair concerning our friend Lanctot. In consequence I count upon your granting me the honor of an interview.

I do not remember whether I saw him at the time or not. I know that he came up to see me during the Christmas holidays and then I asked him for some explanations about this letter which he gave to Mr. Lanctot. I said to him: 'In that letter you say that I have made some promises to you, and that I have to keep my word, my verbal or written promises.' Mr. Lanctot said: 'I never intended to tell that about you, but I wrote that letter to Mr. Lanctot because I thought he would aid in helping me to get the contract which I wanted from you.' He said further 'I have spoken of promises, or alleged promises, made to me, but it was just to induce him to work the harder for me.' Mr. Lanctot wrote me a letter to that effect. He said on the 30th January that he had sent me a letter on the 23rd December. I never received it. Then he wrote the following letter.

By Mr. Devlin:

Q. What is the date?—A. It is dated, Sorel, 14th February, 1911

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. You notice that it is not the same style of writing?—A. Well, it never attracted my attention (reads).

Honourable L. P. BRODEUR,

Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

Ottawa.

HONOURABLE MINISTER:—

If from the letter which I addressed to Mr. Lanctot, our Member, on the 23rd November, 1910, the inference was drawn that I was making malevolent insinuations against you, I state that my thoughts were not translated properly.

I had not the slightest intention in the world of attacking or tarnishing your reputation. On the contrary, I have never ceased to regard your reputation and your character as absolutely unattackable, and, in addition to that, Mr. Minister, I have no reason to doubt your perfect honesty.

Perhaps my letter was not sufficiently precise for those whose interest it is to alienate from me your esteem. However, it appears to me evident, in its entirety, that the hard words it contains are for him to whom it was addressed, and not for you, Mr. Minister, because I have always thought that if I did not obtain that which I asked, it was because Mr. Lanctot did not take the interest in me that I had hoped from him. Several times he showed himself very reticent.

APPENDIX No. 3

If in my letter I speak of promises and of encouragements that you could have given me, it was with the object of stimulating the zeal of Mr. Lanctot and of proving to him that you were not as strongly opposed to my requests as he wished to make me believe.

Once more, Mr. Minister, I have never for an instant doubted your perfect honesty, and I have never wished to tarnish your reputation.

These explanations would have been unnecessary, I am convinced, Mr. Minister, had not the persons interested in depriving me of your esteem sought to draw from my letter a meaning which I had no intention of conveying.

I am confident, Mr. Minister, that my explanations will satisfy you and that you will continue to believe in my best consideration and most respectful sentiments.

Your humble servant,

J. O. LAMOUREUX.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. Who is this Lamoureux?—A. Lamoureux——

Q. He evidently was a friend of Mr. Lanctot's at one time?—A. I do not know whether he was a great friend of Mr. Lanctot, but he claimed to be a friend of his.

Q. I observe in part of the writings which you have read this reference, 'In the interests of the party'?—A. Yes.

Q. What party did he refer to?—A. He was referring perhaps to the Liberal party; I do not know.

Q. He was a Liberal himself and he was asking favours?—A. He always claimed that he was a friend of the party.

Q. Have you any more letters?—A. That is all with respect to these matters.

By Mr. Crockett:

Q. Had this man done any business with the government prior to the writing of this letter?—A. He came up and saw me several times and wanted to sell some machinery to the department, and I told him at last that we could not purchase this machinery, because we did not need it. I met him in Sorel. I remember, one day passing through Sorel some time in September or October he came to see me. I do not remember exactly, perhaps it was in Montreal, but at any rate he called and urged upon me very strongly to purchase this machinery. I thought what he was referring to was this machinery, because when he came up to give me that affidavit he spoke of machinery.

Q. Was his name on the patronage list of the department?—A. There is no patronage list in the department.

Q. There was formerly?—A. There was formerly, but it has been abolished.

Q. Was his name on the patronage list that has been abolished?—A. I could not say.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. You say, Mr. Minister, in your letter of the 5th of December to Mr. Lanctot, that Mr. Lamoureux, after handing over these declarations to you, made an attempt to withdraw them. In what terms? What did he say; what reason did he give?—A. Well, Mr. Lamoureux showed me those declarations made by Douaire and Proulx, and I read them over. I was impressed by the importance of their contents, and I began to discuss the situation with him, and I said: 'I will have to investigate these facts, they are very important.' 'Well,' he said, 'I brought you those documents, but perhaps it would be better not to proceed,' or something of that kind. I could not vouch for the exact words which he used. I said to him, 'Well, Mr. Lamoureux, this is too serious. I am the responsible head of this department, and certain facts have been brought to my knowledge, and it is my duty—it becomes my imperative duty—to look immediately into this question, and I do not want any more delay in the matter.' The affidavits were there on the table, and he was trying,

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

although not formally, to take them, but he seemed to be willing to take them. I said, 'We will keep them and make an investigation.'

Q. Mr. Minister, what I want to find out is this: Is it not true that when he intimated that he might just as well take them back, it was after you had communicated to him that you did not feel inclined to buy the machinery?—A. The question of machinery had come up to me before.

Q. And you had given your answer before?—A. The question had been discussed two or three times before with him.

Q. But at that particular interview you say mention was made of the machinery?—A. The machinery, yes.

Q. And he attempted to take those declarations back after you had intimated that you did not feel inclined to buy the machinery?—A. I told him that as far as the machinery was concerned we did not need it, we had no money or no appropriation for that purpose; and besides, this machinery could not be used effectively in the department at Sorel. That was the information I had from the officers of the department, and under those circumstances I would not be justified in purchasing the machinery.

Q. Now, Mr. Minister, I notice that in this original declaration of Henri Proulx a whole paragraph has been struck out and the word 'retranche' written across. Did that declaration reach you in that condition?—A. Yes, the declaration is in the same condition as it was when it reached me. That paragraph had been struck out and the word 'retranche' was there under it.

By Mr. Crockett:

Q. It is initialled by the commissioner before whom it was sworn?—A. The declaration was not made before a commissioner, but it did not matter to me. You see the facts were mentioned in the declaration, and whether it was a sworn declaration or not I thought it my duty to investigate the matter.

By Mr. Barker:

Q. Had it been declared before anybody?—A. Not before a Notary because there is in the corner of the words 'Witness, J. Bte.-D. Bondy.' He was the witness.

Q. Did he witness the cancellation?

Mr. DEVLIN.—There is his own statement in writing.

Mr. LAFLAMME.—Just as an ordinary letter would be.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—It is signed 'Henri Proulx' and in the corner 'J.-Bte. Bondy. Witness, Sorel, 30th November, 1910.' So the document—although it was declared at the end of the paper that it was a solemn declaration—was not received before the proper officer who could certify as to a solemn declaration of that kind. But, as I told you, I thought it did not make any difference to me whether it was signed before a witness or before a notary public; that as soon as the matter was brought to my attention I thought it was my duty to investigate it.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot ever show you the original letter sent by Mr. Lamoureux to him on the 23rd November?—A. Yes.

Q. A copy of which has been filed?—A. Yes, I think so, but I am not very sure about it. I think he showed it to me.

Q. Will you take communication of this letter and say whether that is the one (handing witness document). A. (After examining document). I would not swear positively that he showed it to me, my impression is that he did so.

Q. You know Lamoureux's signature?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that his signature on that letter?—O. It looks very much the same as the signature on the letters which I have produced. I have not got the least doubt that the letter was signed by him, but I would not swear it positively.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Were you present in the House of Commons on the 6th of March when the Member for Champlain made his declaration?—A. Yes.

Q. It is stated in the declaration among other things that frauds, malversations, robberies and fraudulent appropriations had taken place at Sorel. You remember that?—A. Yes.

Q. Well now, just one question: from the 22nd of November up to the 6th of March did Mr. Blondin ever inquire from you directly or indirectly, verbally or in writing, personally or through outside parties, whether or not the labor had been paid as well as the material?

Question objected to by Mr. McDougall, on the ground that it was introducing the defence before the prosecution had closed its case.

The CHAIRMAN.—The same matter has already been before the Committee and it has been decided that such a question can be asked and answered. (To the witness). You can answer the question.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—No, he did not.

By the Chairman:

Q. Could he have ascertained by inquiry from you that Mr. Lanctot had paid for the labour that was done on his house and also had returned to the department the material which had been supplied to him for that purpose?—A. Yes, Mr. Blondin, being a Member of Parliament, and making an inquiry of that kind I would be very glad, of course, to have given him the information which I had in my department concerning the matter.

Q. Did you have all the information which this Committee has obtained here by this investigation in regard to what had been done, so that you could have given it to him?—A. Certainly, all the information I had I would have given him. It was my duty to do it because I think that a Member of Parliament is entitled in a case like that to the information that the department possesses.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. That is to say you had on the 6th of March all the information required to inform the House generally, as well as Mr. Blondin, that the material had not been fraudulently appropriated, robbed, or stolen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But had been borrowed?—A. Immediately after I got that information, as I told you, I inquired from Mr. Lanctot, and later on from Mr. Papineau, and I was informed that the labor had been reimbursed, had been paid by Mr. Lanctot and that the material had been given back.

Mr. LAFLAMME.—That is all.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. As I understand, that would be a matter of opinion. You considered at that time the matter to be lawful and others may have considered it unlawful?—A. I do not speak of the lawfulness or of the unlawfulness of the matter. I speak of the information which I had been given.

Q. The information which you had?—A. Yes.

Q. And the information which you had, consisted of letters of Mr. Lanctot saying that the matter was all right, that he had borrowed the goods and had paid for them?—A. Yes. He told me that it was true that some men had worked on his house and were retained on the pay list but that he had had reimbursed the money.

Q. And from that you drew an inference?—A. I must say, however, if I remember aright, in all justice to Mr. Lanctot, that he did not think those men were to be put on the list.

Q. And from that you drew the inference that everything was all right. As Minister you were prepared to impart the information, to Mr. Blondin or to anybody

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

else, that everything was all right. A. Without passing judgment on the irregularity of the proceeding I would have been ready to give any Member of Parliament all the information I had because I thought it was for the benefit of all concerned.

Q. And to give the information to everybody else that everything was all right? —A. I must tell you, if you want to have my own opinion on the matter, that at first I inquired how it was that these men were retained on the list and the explanation which was given to me at the time was this—the officer, the timekeeper, who retained those names on the list gave the following explanation: he said that formerly some men had been working outside of the department and they were paid by outside people, or possibly paid by himself—they were paid by himself, I understand—and he was told that some suspicion had been thrown on him at the time that he had kept some money he had received.

Q. You are speaking now of Oscar Champagne?—A. Yes. I am speaking of payments for the work which had been done, that he must have received more money than the amount which he gave to the men; so, he said: 'In order to prevent any more charges of that kind on the part of the men I thought it was better to retain them on the list. That was the explanation given to me.

Q. By Oscar Champagne, I suppose. He is the man you wrote to?—A. Yes.

Q. I think you told us a little while ago, sir, that you would have considered it your bounden duty, or your imperative duty, to make an examination and to investigate the facts after you received these affidavits in order to ascertain whether the charges were true or not. A. Yes.

Q. Did you make such investigation?—A. Yes. I may also say to the Committee, although it has no bearing directly on this question, that I have given instructions also to see that the other statements which are included in these affidavits but do not bear on Mr. Lanctot's case should be investigated, and they are being investigated.

Q. None of this was under oath, it was a simple inquiry?—A. An inquiry.

Q. Did you receive a petition from the citizens of Sorel, or a number of citizens of Sorel, electors, or claiming to be electors—asking you to let the matter die out? If so, will you produce that petition?—A. I do not remember that and I do not think I have received any such document. I am almost as positive as it is possible to be upon that point. There is a great deal of correspondence going on in the department but I do not remember any such document having been sent to me.

Q. Can you ascertain it by a reference to the files of the department?—A. Yes. I will ascertain it. My secretary is perhaps more familiar with the correspondence than I am (after conference with Private Secretary). I have ascertained from my Secretary and he tells me there is nothing of the kind.

Q. You say there is nothing of the kind?—A. Nothing of the kind.

Q. Then personally I understand you to say that you did not receive such a thing?—A. No.

Mr. McDougall.—I have nothing more to ask.

Witness discharged.

Committee adjourned.

Three o'clock, p.m.

ALBERT THIBAUDEAU, called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You live in the city of Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I have the contract for the carriage of the mail at Sorel.

Q. Do you know Mr. Lanctot, the member?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Do you know that during the year 1910, at Sorel, he had a house under construction, which was being painted?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see some men working at that house?—A. I went, in the last part of August, to see Mr. Lanctot, and I saw some men there.

Q. In the last part of August?—A. In the last part of August, between the 25th and the 30th, or the 24th, around these dates, at all events.

Q. You mean between the 24th and the 30th?—A. Between the 24th and the 30th yes, something like that. Perhaps between the 22nd and the 30th; around those dates, at all events.

Q. Did you see Mr. Lanctot there?—A. No sir.

Q. Can you name one or more men you saw working there?—A. Yes; I spoke to Mr. Alfred Douaire.

Q. Alfred Douaire, what is his occupation?—A. He was working, once—at all events, he was doing some painting or some varnishing—painting or varnishing, something similar to that.

Q. Did you speak to him?—A. Yes, I spoke to him; I asked him if he had seen Mr. Lanctot. He told me that he had not seen him.

Q. Did you go there more than once during the month of August, 1910?—A. I went there every four or five days, during the month of August—five days, about, twice or three times a day. I wanted to see Mr. Lanctot for some business and I used to go there.

Q. During those four or five days did you see Douaire there?—A. Yes, I saw Douaire working there.

Q. Have you heard of certain complaints made in Sorel about the building at Mr. Lanctot's? If you heard of certain complaints please tell us the circumstances?—A. About the 29th of November I met Proulx, Henri Proulx. I asked Proulx 'How are you?' 'Well.' I said: 'Where do you work just now, Proulx?' 'He said to me: 'I work where I can.' I said: 'You do not work at the government?' He answered: 'No.' I said: 'Why?' He said: 'I have been dismissed.' Then I said: 'Anyway you get along alright outside, Proulx?' He said: 'At all events I do not work on the other side, but he said, I am well determined, with Douaire, to know how things are going on the other side.' I said: 'What do you have to say?' He answered: 'You see, we work in one place, we work in another place.'

Q. Without quoting the whole conversation, was any reference made to affidavits or solemn declarations?—A. He told me: 'I have a good idea, Douaire and I, we are going to make some declarations and just now we have some made which were handed to Dieudonné Peloquin.' I said: 'Do you think, Proulx, that you are not going too fast?' He said: 'You do not know what my affair is, you?'

Q. Did you see some solemn declarations or some affidavits?—A. Yes, I saw two of them; I have got two here. I asked Proulx and Douaire if they were able to make some declarations for the assertions they had made, to prove what they said was the truth.

Q. Have you got the declarations here?—A. Yes, I have them. I have two of them. I had four. Lamoureux got two; I kept two.

Q. Both affidavits you have with you bear Douaire's and Proulx's signatures, the original signatures?—A. Douaire's and Proulx's signatures, the same than the two given to Lamoureux, and which Lamoureux says he has given to Hon. Mr. Brodeur. They were duplicates, both the same. There are two. He got one and I got the other.

Q. Those written declarations signed by Douaire and Proulx in the presence of the witness; how do you call him?—A. Debondy.

Q. Were they kept by you since that time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You got hold of those declarations about the 29th of November, 1910?—A. The 30th. The 30th, in the evening.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Did you go and see Douaire on the 30th of November?—A. On the 30th, in the afternoon, or in the forenoon, I think.

Q. Where was Douaire working?—A. On board the *Rapid Queen*.

Q. Is she a boat belonging to the government?—A. No; she belongs to the Richelieu Company. *King* or *Queen*, one of the two.

Q. She belongs to the Richelieu Company, anyway?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where were those declarations made?—A. Where they were made, the declarations? Signed or made?

Q. Made, written. Who wrote them, for instance?—A. I did.

Q. Please look at those declarations produced by Hon. Mr. Brodeur this morning as being part of Exhibit No. 30, and tell us if the ones you have with you are alike?

(Witness looks at those declarations.)

A. It is all right; that is it.

Q. What did you do with the affidavits?—A. I kept them, like the other ones. I kept them all; I have got them all.

Q. About the first or the second day of December did you see Mr. Lamoureux. Do you know if he went to Ottawa or some place else?—A. On the first day of December, in the afternoon, Mr. Lamoureux told me he was leaving for Ottawa.

Q. Did you see him when he came back to Sorel, on the 3rd of December?—A. I saw him, yes, on the 3rd, I think. He told me he had given his papers to Mr. Brodeur.

Q. You refer to the two declarations?—A. The declarations similar to those ones, yes.

Q. From the 3rd of December till the month of January, have you heard something else about those transactions in Sorel, about those declarations or complaints?

The WITNESS.—From which date?

The COUNSEL.—From the 3rd of December, the day Mr. Lamoureux came back.

The WITNESS.—If I heard something else concerning Mr. Lanctot?

The COUNSEL.—About those declarations?

A. They came a few times to get them back.

Q. Who?—A. Douaire, Dieudonné Pelouin and Proulx.

Q. To get them back from you?—A. To get them back, yes.

Q. Did you give them back to them?—A. I did not give them back to them, because I did not want to give them to them to do what they intended to do.

Q. Now, let us come to the month of January, at the beginning of January, 1911. Was there anything done about the complaints made for the painting done at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Not myself; I had nothing else outside of that.

Q. Did you make a trip to Quebec?—A. I went to Quebec on New Year's Day, during the holidays.

Q. During the holidays, when you were in Quebec, did you say something to somebody about that?—A. Yes; I met Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the Frontenac.

Q. Did you make a return to him of what was going on, of what you knew?—

A. Yes, I told him that there were rumors in Sorel, and that I thought it would be better, in the interest of the party and of the city, that these things should be put to light, to know if they were true or untrue.

Q. When you say 'in the interest of the party' what party do you refer to?—

A. In the interest of the Liberal party, because, according to the statements made, there have been things on the other side which should not exist.

Q. Were you there, and are now a member of the Liberal party?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had an interview with Sir Wilfrid Laurier in Quebec?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you give a sequence to this interview by a letter which you wrote him?—A. Yes, I wrote him on the 16th.

Q. Have you the letter with you?—A. I have an answer of the 18th.

Q. Have you the letter which you addressed to him?—A. The letter which I sent?

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Yes, you did not keep copy of it?—A. No, sir, I do not keep these.
(Mr. LAFLAMME puts a letter in the hands of the witness who reads it.)

A. That is all right.

Q. After reading a letter dated Sorel, January 16th, 1911, and apparently bearing your signature, which letter has just been produced by Mr. Lanctot, do you say that it is a duplicate or a copy of the letter which you wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier?—A. It is the letter which I have written.

The letter is filed as Exhibit No. 31 and reads as follows:—

SOREL, January 16th, 1911.

HON. SIR WILFRID LAURIER,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa.

HONOURABLE SIR,—I beg to again call to trouble you. I took leave when you came to Quebec on the 5th of January instant to go and give you information about things which exist and which I am perfectly convinced that you are unaware of. I had succeeded in getting the papers which Dieudonné Péroquin a conservative and nationalist had in hand.

I considered that these papers were papers which should not be with hands of an adverse party. I did so in the interest of my party and, to obtain these papers, I was obliged to go into an agreement in writing between Péroquin and myself. I have kept the papers since the 30th of November last (1910) and to day Péroquin requires at any cost that I should give him back the papers as you will find by a letter herewith as also two other documents by which you may see what means the Member Lanctot wishes to take. I do not wish to keep you any longer, only I still have the affidavits and I will do my best to keep them until I have an answer. If you desire to have an interview with me, to examine those papers, I shall go to Ottawa.

I expect this letter will remain absolutely private.

I have the honour to be,

Honourable, Sir,

Yours truly,

A. THIBAUDEAU, Jr.

Q. Will you take communication of this other letter, dated Ottawa, 18th January, 1911, and signed 'Wilfrid Laurier,' which letter is now produced as Exhibit No. 32, and say if it is the letter which you have received in answer to your letter?—A. Yes, sir; it is the answer which I have received.

Exhibit No. 32 reads as follows:—

OTTAWA, January 18th, 1911.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your letter of the 18th of this month I beg to inform you that if any misdoings have been done in Sorel, it is not the intention of the government to prevent them from being known to the public; on the contrary, if you have, or any one has, any other information to give upon what is going on, every latitude will be given you to make the facts public as you may deem advisable.

Yours truly,

WILFRID LAURIER.

M. A. THIBAUDEAU, Jr., Sorel.

Q. Now, from December 2nd to January 18th was there anything done by the government or by others to give publicity to what you considered to be misdoings in Sorel?

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., of counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to this question.

The question is allowed by the Chairman.

A. If there was anything done to ascertain whether there had been any misdoings?

Q. Was there an investigation or anything else?—A. No.

Q. As to Mr. Lanctot's house, did you have any other communications about complaints which were made in Sorel?—A. From others than Mr. Lanctot?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes, I had some.

Q. Did you, for instance, get any from Mr. Peloquin and Mr. Rondeau?—A. Yes; I have the papers of Mr. Peloquin showing that Peloquin consented to give me the papers; and I was obliged to comply with the conditions which had been put in writing, and I also had apart from this visit others made upon me.

Mr. LAFLAMME, K.C., of counsel for Mr. Lanctot, objects to the filing of these papers,

The objection is maintained by the Chairman, as these papers could only be produced by the ones who have written them, and the filing of the same by this witness would only be proof of hearsay.

Q. Finally, have the statements of which you are the bearer, or similar statements, been delivered to Mr. Blondin; if so, under what circumstances?—A. They were not delivered. They came to get them, but I would not give them up.

Q. Have these statements, or similar statements, been given to Mr. Blondin; if so, under what circumstances were they given?—A. The statements given to Mr. Blondin were statements which were made after those.

Q. Under what circumstances?—A. Under what circumstances were they given to Mr. Blondin?

Q. Yes?—A. It was because Proulx, Douaire and Sénécal gave some statements, and they desired that these statements should be put into the hands of Mr. Blondin. I had consented that, if I could not fix that so that—at any rate, in the best way, I would be bound to give them back to Mr. Blondin. I agreed to that, and I did it. I had a statement of Mr. Sénécal; I kept it with me for about two months and a half; and when Sénécal came back, and he also wanted to have his statement, with the statement of Douaire and Proulx, and they told me: 'You have been bought out. We shall go and see Villiard to make a statement.' I told them: 'Go, if you like. What is it to me?' Then Sénécal came back, and he went to carry his statement to Mr. Villiard's.

Q. Of all these arrangements that you speak of about these statements, did Mr. Blondin know anything?—A. He knew something when we gave them to him.

Q. When were they given to Mr. Blondin?—A. Well, I cannot say when it was that they were given to him. I think it was—I do not know exactly when they were given.

Q. As far as you can know yourself, did Mr. Blondin know anything about these arrangements before the statements were delivered to him?—A. If he knew anything, he did not know it through me.

Q. When you say: 'Fix in the best way,' what do you mean by that?—A. Fix in the best way, what do I mean?

Q. You have said that you did not wish to give up the papers before you had 'settled the matter in the best way.'—A. I said to Proulx: 'Wait a little for this story, there is no hurry.' They said: 'That is not it; it must be fixed.' I said: 'If it must be fixed, fix it between yourselves.' I then was getting tired of it. I said: 'Fix the matter between you.' For some space of time I would have needed a porter in my house.

Q. What arrangements had you in sight? With whom were you desirous of having arrangements?—A. I thought it would come to be settled in their having an understanding between themselves. Not I. I have nothing to ask for. Or else they would come to say: 'Well we will get tired, we are going to let that go' or something of the sort. They were all 'toughs.'

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Then, I understand that you wanted to wait, so as to let the matter die out?—
A. Oh, if I had been able to; yes—but when I saw that I could not, I had to let the matter go.

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C., of counsel for Mr. Lanctot says he has no cross-examination to put to the witness.

ADELARD LANCTOT, M.P., recalled and examined.

By Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Lanctot, is it not a fact that you have boarded at the convent or at the hospital, in Sorel from the 15th of May, 1910, until the 12th of October?—A. I have boarded at the hospital, but I could not exactly say the date.

Q. Did not Madame Lanctot, your wife board there from the 20th of June until say the 20th of July, 1910?—A. I think that she came to spend sometime in Sorel from Saranac. Her physician had sent her to see if she was well enough to come back to Sorel.

Q. Between the dates I have mentioned, from the 20th of July?—A. I did not notice the dates.

Q. Are these dates not correct?—A. I could not say.

Q. Do you say that these dates are.....?—A. I do not say that they are not correct—I am telling you that I do not remember; I did not take notes of the matter. They must be all right.

Q. Now, Madame Lanctot returned to Saranac about the 20th of July and she came back to the convent about the 18th of September, did she not?—A. On the 27th of September.

Q. On the 27th of September?—A. Yes.

Q. You remember that date?—A. I asked my wife when she came back, and she told me she came back on the 27th.

Q. And she left the convent about what time in November?—A. She left it when we went into our house, about the 25th or 26th of November, I think.

Q. You moved into your new house about the 25th of November?—A. We had moved before, but the painting not being dry enough, the smell was too high, and my wife had to go and sleep in the hospital.

Mr. N. K. LAFLAMME, K.C., of counsel for Mr. Lanctot states that he has no cross-examination to put to the witness.

And the committee adjourned.

TUESDAY, March 28, 1911.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Mr. ISAIE TRUDEAU, sworn.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Mr. Trudeau, what is your occupation?—A. I am the Manager of the painting department of the Henry Morgan Company.

Q. That is at Montreal?—A. Montreal.

Q. How long have you been occupying that position?—A. Eleven years.

Q. Did you examine Mr. Adelard Lanctot's house recently, and if so, when?—
A. I did.

Q. When?—A. On Sunday.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. For what purpose?—A. To estimate the value of the work that was done in the house.

Q. What kind of work?—A. Painting work.

Q. Did you make a valuation?—A. I did.

Q. Including material and labour?—A. Including the material and labour.

Q. What conclusion did you arrive at?—A. Do you mean conclusion as to price?

Q. Yes?—A. Well, I calculated the value of the work done in Mr. Lanctot's house, interior and exterior, governed by local conditions, to be of the value of \$491.

Q. Will that include a profit that a contractor would add to the value of the job if he took it as a job?—A. I would estimate a profit of 15 or 20 per cent could be taken out of that.

Mr. LAFLAMME.—That is all, Mr. Trudeau.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. How do you make your figures?—A. I beg pardon.

Q. How do you make your figures?—A. Well, in the usual way of estimating, I have reduced the amount to yards, at so much per yard.

Q. At so much per yard—then you measured the number of yards necessary to paint in Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I did.

Q. How many yards?—A. There are different kinds of work, I have it here, for instance, for the walls inside the house I arrived at 685 square yards, painted two coats.

Q. You are reading from a statement in writing?—A. I am.

Q. Will you put it in after you get through reading it, will you produce it?—A. I will.

Q. All right, go on.—A. 685 yards at thirteen cents per yard \$89.05; finished woodwork first floor, 285 yards at 30 cents, \$85.50; finishing woodwork on second floor which is not quite so well finished as downstairs, I estimate at 25 cents per square yard, 221 yards, \$55.25; balustrade, 50 yards—of course we have different ways of measurement, a man might measure a square flat yard, but take a door where there are mouldings and panels, you have to make allowance for the entire work connected with it; every man has a system of his own of measuring and extending his yards, so you cannot be exact to an inch—50 yards at 40 cents, \$20.00; floors, oiled, shellaced and varnished, there are 198 yards, at 16 cents per yard, \$31.68; exterior painting of clapboards, windows, gallery ceilings, entrys and columns, 1,191 yards at 15 cents, \$178.65; and 1,250 feet of glass, set only, not to buy the glass, but simply to put in the glass at 2½ cents per foot, \$31.25; making a sum total of \$491.33.

Q. How many coats of paint were there put on?—A. A coat of priming and two coats of paint.

Q. Your estimate is based on one coat of priming and two coats of paint?—A. Three coat work, except where I stated here, inside walls, I found them very transparent, and I would estimate them to be one coat of size and two coats of paint, in all three coats.

Q. Do you know what scraping or polishing was done, then?—A. Scraping and polishing, I did not know there would be any because the woodwork is new I understand.

Q. Do you know what amount of polishing was done? That is how do you include that in your statement?—A. At per yard for the finishing.

Q. But you do not know what amount of polishing was done?—A. No scraping. I looked at it—

Q. You simply looked at the house on Sunday, you had never seen it before?—A. I had never seen it before, I might say I studied the plans since very carefully besides seeing the painting.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Upstairs in the house is there any wall papering done?—A. On three rooms.

Q. Did you include that in your estimate?—A. I did not.

Q. That is not at all included?—A. That is not at all included.

Q. If you add that to your estimate how much would that be?—A. The labour part of it?

Q. The labour and the material?—A. To supply the material too—well I dare say about \$20.

Q. Is that for the labour?—A. For the labour and material, the labour is only a matter of \$6 or \$7, \$6 probably.

Q. You spoke of local conditions, that these estimates are based on local conditions?—A. I did.

Q. What you mean by that is the prices prevailing there?—A. The prices prevailing in the town where the work is done.

Q. Well, were you familiar with prices at Sorel?—A. I made myself familiar, yes.

Q. In what way?—A. By finding out what wages are paid; wages cut the most figure in painting work, because in painting work 75 or 80 per cent is labour and the balance is material, that is the way we arrive at it.

Q. You were only there on Sunday, and you made yourself familiar with the prices paid to painters there at Sorel. What are the prices paid, on the average?—A. I understand that the price of painting is \$1.50 to \$2 a-day for painters.

Q. Who did you get that information from?—A. From Mr. Pagé.

Q. From Mr. J. B. Pagé?—A. Yes, Sir.

Q. One of the witnesses?—A. I don't know who he is.

Q. He is government foreman of painters, isn't he?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you get this information also from Mr. Lanctôt, prices and local conditions?—A. No, he didn't venture any, when I first went to see Mr. Lanctôt he wasn't there.

Q. How did you happen to run up against Mr. Pagé and make these inquiries?—A. I inquired who I could see to make inquiries of.

Q. To whom? Mr. Lanctôt, was it?—A. I asked Mr. Lanctôt when I came in about local conditions and prices.

Q. And he referred you to Mr. Pagé?—A. Yes.

Q. You saw Mr. Pagé?—A. I did.

Q. Did you see anybody else about it?—A. Mr. Baril.

Q. He is the accountant at the government shipyards, is he?—A. I do not know, I never met him before, I examined his house there.

Q. His house has also been painted, has it. Is his house near Mr. Lanctôt's?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you inquire of him, as to prices and conditions?—A. I was informed that a local painter had done his work by contract and he asked me to examine his house and see what I thought of it and compare prices. He gave me information I wanted to know about certain conditions. I found out the day work conditions, that is what they paid men per day, I also tried to find out from his remarks what they would pay a contractor for doing certain work.

Q. What were the prices he gave per day for painters?—A. Mr. Baril told me he paid \$250 to get his house painted throughout.

Q. That is day work and labour?—A. That is labour only.

Q. Did he say how much he paid per day?—A. No, he did not. He remarked that the man had made a certain amount of money per day, but that he did not work regularly.

Q. Did he give you the name of the man who had done the work?—A. I do not know that he did—yes, he did, Cartier was the name.

Q. Your estimate is based on what price per day for painters?—A. An average of about \$1.85 per day.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Would you say that would be a fair price, \$1.85 on the average?—A. Yes.

Q. How many days' work for the painting would you estimate to amount in all to \$491; after deducting, or including 15 to 20 per cent profit how many days' work would the labour that you included in that estimate come to?—A. That I have not figured out.

Q. Well, will you figure it now?—A. We estimate all painting by yards and we have to take our chance on coming out at the right end.

Q. You ought to be able to give us an idea of how many men you would require, of how many days it would take to do that work?—A. I presume 200—190 days or something like that.

Q. You can say that on oath from your experience in painting?—A. Of course I say I would not care to bind myself to that, we are not accustomed to estimate that way, we estimate by the yard, that is a rule of thumb method.

Q. And the approximate number of days, on your oath you say that 190 to 200 days would be a fair time?—A. I consider it would be a fair time in which to do the work.

Q. How much would you say the paint and material would amount to which went into the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. The paint, varnish, &c.?

Q. Yes, the whole thing?—A. Probably \$100 or \$110 outside the glass; perhaps \$120, between \$100 and \$120.

Q. And the glass would take how much?—A. An average of 1,200 feet, there are a lot of large and small panes, I did not get the total quantity, and the amount of glass, but I would consider 6 cents a foot on the average for the whole thing.

Q. That would amount to how much?—A. About \$75, \$70 or \$75.

Mr. McDougall, K.C.—That is all.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. When you put the value on the paint I suppose you took also local conditions into consideration, that is to say the retail price there?—A. Yes.

Q. Of course it would be somewhat less if you took the wholesale price?—A. Well, I considered the wholesale price plus 15 per cent. I do not know what the local conditions are on retail prices.

(Estimate prepared by Mr. Trudeau produced and filed as Exhibit No. 33.)

EXHIBIT NO. 33.

Mr. Lanctot—

685 yards walls painted (1 coat size) at 13 cents.	\$	89 05
Finishing wood work 1st floor, at 30 cents (285 yards).		85 50
Finishing wood work 2nd floor, at 25 cents (221 yards).		55 25
Balustrade, 50 yards, at 40 cents.		20 00
Floors, oil, shellac and varnish, 198, 16 cents.		31 68
Exterior painting of clapboard, windows, galleries, ceilings, columns 1,191 yards.		15,178 65
1,250 feet glass set only 2½ cents a foot.		31 25
		<hr/>
		491 38

Witness discharged.

APPENDIX No. 3

JOSEPH DAGENAIS sworn:—

By Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Dagenais?—A. In Montreal.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Painter and contractor.

Q. How long have you been a painter?—A. Sixteen years.

Q. Have you lately examined Mr. Lanctot's house, and if so tell us when?—A. Yes, sir. I went there on the 12th of March.

Q. For what purpose?—A. I went there to make an estimate of the work of painting.

Q. Did you make that estimate?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To what conclusion did you arrive as to the value of the materials and the work? As to the cost of the work of painting?—A. The cost of the work of painting amounts to \$502.71.

Q. This would naturally include the profits?—A. This includes the profits.

Q. What percentage of profit would you calculate on such a job?—A. I allowed about 12½ or 15 per cent.

Cross-examined by Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. How do you make your calculation?—A. I measured from the plans, by the yard.

Q. For the painting?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many yards did you find? Give us the particulars?—A. I found 1,655 yards of painting, with three coats of paint.

Q. At how much per yard?—A. 12 cents a yard, sir.

Q. Is that all you have in your calculation?—A. There is the clapboard, the outside; I allowed 10 cents per yard for that.

Q. How many yards are there?—A. 425 yards.

Q. Have you any other particulars?—A. I have the wood work, the hardwood and the tinted wood inside; 634 yards at 20 cents.

Q. And then?—A. Then there is the glazing; the glazing comes next.

Q. And what about the glazing?—A. There is 1,300 feet of glass?

Q. 1,300 feet—A. Yes.

Q. You mean the work of setting panes of glass?—A. Yes.

Q. You are not speaking about the panes themselves?—A. No, sir.

Q. How much per foot do you allow for that?—A. Three cents a foot.

Q. Have you anything else?—A. I see nothing else.

Q. Then this is your estimate in detail?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For the men's time and for the work?—A. For the time of work and the paint, with the exception of the glass.

Q. Upstairs, in Mr. Lanctot's house, did you see any wall paper?—A. Yes, sir.

.. Q. Is that included in your estimate, the paperhanging, upstairs?—A. No, sir, that is not included.

Q. If you were to add what was done upstairs in paperhanging, how much more would you add?—A. For work.

Q. Yes, the work and—A. The wall paper?

Q. Yes?—A. It is hard to say because there are different prices for wall paper. The wall paper must be worth about two or three dollars at most, for each room.

Q. And now the work of paperhanging?—A. A day and half at most.

Q. At how much?—A. \$1.80 or \$1.85.

Q. Who showed you the house when you went to make this calculation?—A. Mr. Lanctot.

Q. Mr. Lanctot himself?—A. Yes, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Was there anybody else present?—A. There was a certain Mr. Bélanger.

Q. Did you know what were the rates of wages in Sorel then?—A. I inquired about the rate of wages of men in Sorel.

Q. Tho whom did you ask the rate of painter's wages in Sorel at that time?—A. To Mr. Bélanger.

Q. Is Mr. Bélanger a painter?—A. Yes, sir. I think he is a foreman.

By the Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Was it not Pagé, rather?—A. Mr. Pagé, yes.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. He was with you and Lanctot, Jean Baptiste Pagé?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you not know that he was foreman of the government's painters in Sorel?—A. He told me he was foreman, but he never told me that he was foreman for the government.

Q. While you were making your calculations, he was showing you the rooms, I suppose?—A. I took them from the plans, sir.

Q. Did you not go to the house?—A. Yes, sir. I saw the house.

Q. Did Mr. Pagé go with you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I suppose Mr. Pagé told you who had done the painting?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he tell you how many coats of paint had been laid?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you see that yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many coats of paint were applied?—A. Inside?

Q. Both inside and outside?—A. In my opinion, I calculated three coats at the most.

Q. That is to say one coat of priming and two other coats after that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has Pagé told you who had been papering upstairs?—A. No, sir.

Q. Now, how have you been able to know the price of painters, in Sorel?—A. It is Mr. Pagé.

Q. Then, do you think that \$1.85 is a good average for painters, in Sorel?—A. About that.

Q. In comparison with Montreal, is it about the same thing?—A. In Montreal, it is a little higher.

Q. Can you say what would be about the difference between Montreal and Sorel?—A. It would be a question of capacity, as for the difference between men.

Q. In order to establish the difference between prices in Sorel and in Montreal, how much would you be expected to pay, for instance, in Montreal, for the painting of a house as the one of Mr. Lanctot, for the men and for the work?—A. We can get the same work done for \$1.80 or \$1.90 as at Mr. Lanctot.

Q. Then, the price is the same in Montreal as in Sorel?—A. That would depend on the quality of the men, sir.

Q. Do you say that, in Montreal, you can get painters for \$1.85 per day?—A. \$1.85, \$1.90.

Q. According to your estimation, how many days did it take to paint Mr. Lanctot's house? The time of the men, the work done, what you have estimated?—A. I have not done much estimation—I have estimated by the yard, not by the day.

Q. I want to try that now by the day?—A. By the day, the difference might be considerable; if a man works very slowly; it makes a good deal of difference.

Q. Take ordinary men, those who are generally employed in this country. They are not slow; they are ordinary men?—A. There is a good deal of difference for the men doing paint-work; quickness is here quite a consideration.

Q. You have based your estimation on ordinary men?—A. Yes.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Now, for ordinary men, tell us how many working days it would take to do the work which you estimate at \$502.71?—A. It would take from 230 to 240 hours to do the same kind of work.

Q. 240 hours?—A. About that. I have not made a strict calculation.

Q. How much paint would be required to paint Mr. Lanctot's house, as you have seen it painted?—A. Well, I allow \$85 to \$90 for the material that has got in there—the paint.

Q. What would be included in that?—A. The materials.

Q. What does that include?—A. Paint, oil, varnish and colours.

Q. And shellac?—A. No, not shellac. I don't know if there is any shellac there. I calculate there have been two coats of varnish.

Q. The putty?—A. The putty, yes, sir.

Q. The brushes?—A. Yes.

Q. The paint-brushes?—A. Yes.

WITNESS discharged.

JOSEPH RIVET, sworn.

By Mr. N. R. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. What is your occupation, Mr. Rivet?—A. Manufacturer.

Q. Of what?—A. Doors and sashes.

Q. You reside in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the year 1910, did you have any paint-work to do at Mr. Lanctot's house, on George street?—A. I have only painted the doors and windows.

Q. Did you present a bill for that work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you examine the bill that I am showing you as exhibit No. 34, and tell us if that bill includes in part the kind of work which you have just mentioned?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Rivet, will you tell the Committee how much, on the total amount of that bill, you charge for the work which you have done at Mr. Lanctot's, and how much you charge for the paint which you have furnished for that work?—A. For the paint, it has cost \$13.

Q. And how much for the labour?—A. \$12.

Q. That makes \$25?—A. Yes.

Q. When has that work been done, Mr. Rivet?—A. Every time the doors and window were being delivered.

Q. Yes, but in what part of the season of 1910, as near as you can say?—A. You mean, when have the doors and windows been completed?

Q. Yes.—A. They have been delivered in July and August.

Cross-examined by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. The painting of those doors and windows has been done in your own shop, has it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have done that work during the winter and the spring?—A. A part.

Q. What part of the work have you done during the winter and the spring?—A. The window sashes.

Q. You have painted the whole of the window sashes during the winter and the spring?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you have delivered them, all painted, when?—A. They were delivered in July and August. A part of them has even been delivered in the spring, because my shop was small, those windows were ready, and the house was vacant, so they were put in the house.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. Then, all the window sashes have been manufactured at your shop and delivered at the house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the cost of the paint used for those sashes?—A. \$13.

Q. Then, you have not painted any doors or windows at Mr. Lanctot's house itself?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has the work which you estimate for \$12 been all for the windows?—A.

Q. When you say \$13 and \$12 for the time of the men, do you mean the time of the men for the painting of the window sashes?—A. Yes, yes.

Q. How many doors and windows were there in all?—A. About fifty—fifty to fifty-two.

Q. I see here in the bill '49 doors and windows, according to contract.' Is that it?—A. It is about that, yes.

Q. It took you \$13 worth of paint for the first coat on the windows?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And \$12 to apply the paint?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Don't you think that \$13 worth of paint is a good deal for \$12 worth of work?—A. The first coat on doors and windows, as well as on any other wood-work, always takes more paint than when another coat has already been applied.

Q. You mean that the first coat always takes more paint than the other coats?—A. Yes.

WITNESS discharged.

ROSARIO GOULET, sworn.

By Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. What is your occupation, Mr. Goulet?—A. Grocer.

Q. Where do you live?—A. In Sorel, quite near Mr. Lanctot's.

Q. During the summer of 1910, did you hear any conversation between some government employees of the shipyard and Mr. Lanctot?

Mr. McDougall, K.C., counsel for Mr. Blondin, objects to that question inasmuch as the best proof of the conversations between Mr. Lanctot and the persons to whom the question refers is the deposition of those persons themselves.

Mr. LAFLAMME withdraws the question.

Q. Did you hear any conversations between Mr. Lanctot on the one part and Mr. Champagne and Mr. Jean-Baptiste Page, on the other part, and if so, what did you hear?

Mr. McDougall, K.C., objects to that question for the same reason as that given above for the objection to the preceding question. The question is allowed by the Chairman.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what month was it?—A. It must have been about July or in the early part of August.

Q. In what place?—A. In my store.

Q. Did you hear Mr. Lanctot ask anything to Mr. Page and Mr. Champagne and if so, what was it.

Same objection as above on the part of Mr. McDougall.

Same ruling.

A. Mr. Lanctot was using my telephone, in my store. I used to come often and telephone without having paid any particular attention to what he said, I often understood that he told them to send some paint, to keep a careful account of it and to charge it to himself. These are his own words. I know, I noticed that he said to keep a detailed account of the materials that would be sent.

APPENDIX No. 3

Cross-examined by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. That was in July and in August?—A. I cannot tell the date exactly. It may have been at the beginning of July. I can not tell the date exactly. I know that it was in the course of the summer, when the painting was beginning.

Q. You are speaking about Oscar Champagne, the checker, the man who is time-keeper for the men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you tell us that Mr. Lanctot came to your place to telephone to Mr. Page, to tell them to send some paint and to keep an account of it, you mean to speak also about Jean-Baptiste Page, the painter's foreman?—A. Yes, sir.

Witness discharged.

AGENOR CHAPDELAINE sworn.

By Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. What is your occupation, Mr. Chapdelaine?—A. Collector of His Majesty's Customs.

Q. You live in Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At what distance from Mr. Lanctot's?—A. Mr. Lanctot's house is built on my line.

Q. On the division line of your lot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are neighbours?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On George street?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, will you tell the committee if during the summer of 1910, there was a fence around Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. In 1910?

Q. Yes?—A. There was a fence before that, but it was taken down.

Q. When was it taken down?—A. When they commenced to build the foundation wall and the woodwork.

Q. So that the fence was taken down in 1909?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they did not put it up again?—A. It has not been put up yet.

Q. If that is true, it goes without saying that nobody can have repaired this fence during three days in 1910?—A. The only repair that was done was when myself and wife put up a span of fence and stood it up against Mr. Lanctot's veranda to keep the dogs out.

Q. I suppose, Mr. Chapdelaine that, as a civil servant, you do not leave your office very often and that you are at home every day at Sorel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know if there are any fruit trees on the Lanctot's lot?—A. There are none.

Q. There are no fruit trees?—A. There are none.

Q. You are very sure of that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know if there is a garden, big or small, around Mr. Lanctot's house?—

A. None has been made so far, at any rate.

Mr. McDougall, K.C., declares that he does not desire to cross-examine the witness.

Witness discharged.

AMABLE LUSSIER sworn:

By Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. What is your occupation, Mr. Lussier?—A. I am a merchant.

Q. Where do you live?—A. In Sorel.

Q. What line of business are you in?—A. Dry goods and furniture.

Q. Last year were you in a position to know if there were any painters available in Sorel?—A. I got posted on the subject because I wanted painters myself.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. And what did you find out?—A. I wanted to overhaul the house as usual—I have a large house, and, about the month of April I spoke to a contractor for painting, who was one of my good customers, and to whom I wanted to give the job.

Q. It was in the month of April?—A. It was in the month of April.

Q. And what happened then?—A. I asked him if he wanted to do my work, without specifying the price nor anything. He said to me: “Mr. Lussier, I will complete some work I have on hand and I will go to your place in a few days.” After having waited several days, as he was not coming, I asked him: “What are you doing, that you do not come?” He told me: “Why don’t you send your doors and windows at my place—that is to say, the blinds and the doors, to be imitated—that work will be done right away, and then I will send men at the house.”

Mr. McDougall objects to evidence bearing on conversations which witness may have had with the good customer to whom he has just referred.

(No decision arrived at.)

Q. Have you experienced any difficulty in doing your paint work?—A. I waited for that man during four weeks, for the work which he had to do.

Q. Why did you have to wait four weeks?—A. Because I could find nobody. Then, I went to another man, one named Raymond, and I think it was in the month of May that he came and that he began to work for me. But he assigned to the work men who had already worked elsewhere, and those men used to come at my place to work one or two hours per day, and the rest of the time they went to work at some other job. The same men were working for another customer, and they were dividing their time. But, in the end, he was forced to give up working for me, because I had too much to do.

Q. That was in the month of May?—A. It continued that way, in May. In the interval, seeing that my work was not progressing, I had a man named Lavoie, who came to do all my paper-hanging. Then, the work was suspended until June, about the eight or the tenth. I could then get nobody.

It was then that I went to see a man named Douaire, and I asked his wife if her husband could not come to work for me. She told me: “He works for the department, I don’t know if he can leave his work. If you ask Mr. Pagé, the foreman, he might perhaps let you have men for your work.” As Mr. Pagé was a friend of mine, I went to ask him if, to render me service, he could not let me have a couple of men. On the morrow, which was a Tuesday, I think, he told me that he would let me have two men, Mr. Henri Proulx and H. Bergeron.

Cross-examined by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. That was in April and May, you say?—A. I got the men from Mr. Pagé in June, after the tenth of June.

Q. Was it you who paid them?—A. Of course, sir.

Q. In the middle of May and April, who was that good customer to whom you went to get your work done?—A. Mr. Payette.

Q. Augustin Payette?—A. I don’t know his first name. He is a young man who does job-work, and who works a good deal at paper-hanging, and he was buying his paper from us. As he was one of our customers, I offered him my job.

Q. That was in April?—A. That I asked him that, yes. After that he gave up working for me. That is to say, I sent to his place for the window sashes in the third week of May.

Q. And you never asked him again to work for you?—A. Work had been started on my doors and windows. I kept asking him: “Are you going to work for me?” In the meanwhile, I was informed that he had another contract for another party, a contract much more important than mine, and which he could not give up. And then he told me that he could not work for me.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. You had Mr. Raymond, also?—A. Mr. Raymond came. As I said, he had other work under way, and he had seven or eight jobs distributed among his men.

Q. That was again in May?—A. Mr. Raymond kept working until the first days of June. And then I was kept waiting during one week. Mr. Raymond began to work in the month of May, but it was after the tenth of June that I had men from the department to do my work.

Q. When you speak of a man named Proulx who had been sent you by Mr. Pagé, do you mean Henri Proulx?—A. It was a man by the name of Proulx, who was working for the department. I can't tell exactly what is his first name. He is a nephew of Mr. Proulx. It's the same one who has already appeared as a witness, here.

Q. At that time, did you know that George Cartier was a painter in Sorel?—A. Ah, yes, I know George Cartier very well.

Q. You never asked him to do your work?—A. I saw that he had more work than he could do.

Q. I am asking you if you ever asked him to do paint-work for you?—A. No, sir, I never asked him. I had no time to lose going on such errands.

Q. Do you know a man name Joseph Proulx, a painter, at Sorel?—A. No, sir. The Proulx that I know is a railway agent. He may have done some paint-work in his youth, though I don't know.

Q. No, that is not the one.—A. I don't know any other.

Q. Another Joseph Proulx.—A. He must be quite a stranger in Sorel.

Q. You don't know him?—A. No.

Q. Do you know a man named Telesphore Barnabé?—A. Barnabé, yes.

Q. A painter?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. Have you ever asked him to make that painting work for you?—A. No, sir, I did not want to ask him.

Q. Do you know Emile Lavoie?—A. Yes, sir. I had him during the time he could spare for me, to do the papering.

Q. Do you say that on the 10th of June, George Cartier was so busy that he could not do your work?—A. I say that he had a lot of work in hand on that day, on the 10th of June, perhaps a Sunday, he might have been free; but I say that Mr. Cartier had more work than he could do and I did not solicit him.

Q. How many days did the men sent you by Pagé work, Proulx or others? Did they work at your place?—A. I do not remember. I paid them myself. Those two men must have worked, all together, nine or ten days, about that, not nine or ten days each but between them.

Q. Four and half or five days each?—A. Perhaps it was not divided equally, but it is about that.

Q. Do they work together at your house?—A. Yes, they worked together, not all the time, perhaps. I think that Proulx was the last one to work. I was not always there, I was at the store.

Q. To whom did you pay the wages; to Pagé or to the men?—A. To each of the men.

Q. How much per day?—A. I asked them how much it was; Proulx, I think, told me it was two dollars. I did not ask him how much he earned at the department; I did not argue on the price he asked me, because I considered as a favour to have come and done my work; I was satisfied to give them what they were asking me. I think it was two dollars.

Q. You gave two dollars to Proulx?—A. I think it was two dollars. Around that, anyway.

Q. You must remember it?—A. Well, sir, listen, when you are completely disinterested of a thing as the case was, I did not see fit to keep an account of it.

Q. What is the price you paid those men?—A. To the best of my knowledge, I gave two dollars to Mr. Proulx.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. To the best of your knowledge, how much did you give to his companion?—

A. I do not remember; I think his wages were a little lower. At any rate, I gave him what he asked me. I cannot say exactly how much.

Q. You do not know his name?—A. Yes, his name is Bergeron.

Q. Did you get some paint or was it your own paint you supplied?—A. I had my own paint, that is I was buying my paint at the stores.

Witness discharged.

ALFRED LAVALLEE SWORN.

By Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Lavallée?—A. At Sorel, sir.

Q. On or about the 7th of December, 1910, did you meet Mr. Alfred Douaire?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please tell the committee how you met him and what happened?—A. The same evening you ask me if I saw Mr. Douaire, I met Mr. Lanctot about six o'clock, about dinner time. I shook hands with him. I think he had just arrived from here. He said: 'I bring you very sad news.' He said: 'You are charged with such and such things.' I said: 'What about?' He said: 'A report, an affidavit, a man named Douaire has sent, has signed, for some doors which have been glazed.' I told him I did not know it. I did not know anything about it—I never had Mr. Douaire in my employ.

Q. I suppose that after that conversation with Mr. Lanctot, you began to go around a little?—A. Yes.

Q. Was it the cause of your interview with Douaire?—A. I told Mr. Lanctot: 'How is that?' I wanted to know where that affidavit was coming from. He told me: 'I have got it in my possession.' I said: 'You will read it to me. I am going to see him.'

Q. And did you see Mr. Douaire?—A. Immediately after dinner I went to Mr. Douaire's.

Q. What did you say to Douaire?—A. I said:— I walked in, I said good night, all that, I talked for a moment, I said: 'Say, Alfred, come outside, I wish to speak to you.' He went outside. I said: 'Listen, what does that all mean?'

Mr. McDougall objects to that evidence.

Q. Then, I understand you went to Mr. Douaire's yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Lanctot never asked for him?—A. No, sir. I looked after that matter myself. I said: "I am going to see about that and confer with Douaire about that matter."

Q. Did you bring him to Mr. Lanctot's office?—A. Yes. I asked him, I said—

Q. Was he walking fast or was he reluctant?—A. He seemed to be hesitating, he did not like it; he did not seem to like that.

Witness discharged.

LÉON CARDIN SWORN:

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. What is your occupation, Mr. Cardin?—A. I am a student, sir.

Q. Are you the son of Joseph Cardin, contractor?—A. I am.

Q. Do you know if your father did some work at Mr. Lanctot's house in the summer of 1910?—A. He did, sir.

Q. What did he do?—A. It was he who superintended the carpenters.

Q. Did you have anything to do with that work?—A. Not directly.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Did you keep the books?—A. No, sir; however I myself prepared a pay list which I would hand over to one of the employees, who would himself keep the time of the men; then the latter would give me back that pay list.

Q. There is a man named Desrosiers who worked for your father?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know when he finished his work?—A. I could know it by a paper, I think, by a list. As it is, I do not know, but I think it is entered upon a pay-list to which is annexed a piece of paper as this one.

Q. Will you take communication of Exhibit No. 35 and tell us what it is?—A. There are two pay-lists, one finishing on the 18th of August, 1910, and another finishing on September 1st, 1910.

Q. Does Mr. Desrosiers' name appear on both of these lists?—A. It appears on both the lists. Upon the one finishing on the 18th of August and upon the one of September 1st, 1910.

Q. What is the surname of Mr. Desrosiers?—A. I do not know; his initial is H. I do not know exactly what it is.

Q. What sort of work did he accomplish for Mr. Lanctot?—A. He was a carpenter.

Q. Are you able to state approximately when he finished his work?—A. Oh, as I am now, I cannot say so, but I think I have entered it upon a list, as my father, at that time, had another job and when he was over at that place he sent Mr. Desrosiers to work at another job. I think it is entered upon a list.

Q. Do you know if Mr. Desrosiers worked there in September?—A. I could tell you, but I cannot say now. If I had the paper, I could tell you. There is a paper like this (showing) and another annexed to it as this (showing). This one records the day when he went, in the morning or in the afternoon.

Q. Well, you look at this Exhibit No. 36, and say if on this pay-list finishing on September 15th, 1910, the name of Desrosiers does not appear?—A. It appears for the whole fortnight, from the Friday, and this ended on September 15th. That is exactly 12 days.

Q. He was a carpenter?—A. A carpenter.

Q. The names which appear upon this list, Exhibit No. 36: Deguise, Matte, the other Mr. Matte, Mr. Phaneuf and Mr. Paul, are they carpenters?—A. Mr. Phaneuf was an apprentice. Mr. Matte was a carpenter. Mr. Phaneuf and Mr. Paul are two apprentices.

Q. So that there is no doubt, then, on the 15th of September, there were four or five carpenters who was still working in the house?—A. Not upon this list.

Q. From that list?—A. No, that list was for the other job.

Q. Will you examine your papers and produce an identical list where the name of Mr. Desrosiers appear for the last time with regard to Mr. Lanctot's house?

—A. I think I have a list—

Q. Where is that list?—A. I have already produced it, I think.

Q. You have not produced it, you have not been heard as a witness yet?—A. I think that Mr. Lanctot has it.

Q. Can you say when the wood-work was finished in the house?—A. To begin with, the carpenters left the house, I think, about the beginning of the month of September, and went to work on a job which my father had at that time another job for Mr. Marcotte, and some came back to finish up the work at Mr. Lanctot's house.

Q. So that according to exhibit No. 36 Mr. Marcotte's job was not finished before the 15th of September?—A. Marcotte's job was not finished, no.

Q. Not before the 15th of September?—A. No.

Q. It was after the 15th of September that some of these carpenters came back to work at Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. Yes, sir.

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912

Q. How many, do you know, came back to Mr. Lanctot's house?—A. I am not sure; but I think there were three.

Q. Will you look at exhibit 37 and say if the three carpenters who came back to work after the 15th September at the house of Mr. Lanctot are not the three whose names appear on exhibit No. 37, Deguise, H. Desrosiers and A. Paul?—A. That must be.

Q. Now, Mr. Cardin, the paint-work was not commenced before the wood-work was finished?—A. I could not swear to it but, according to me, I think not.

Q. The work which is mentioned on the statement of November 14th, was work done personally?

(The witness examines the account.)

Q. Do you observe that the items are not dated? When did these men work?—A. They worked before that.

Q. You do not know when?—A. No, I do not know.

Cross examined by Mr. McDougall, K.C.

Q. What is your first name, Mr. Cardin?—A. Léon Cardin.

Q. When was the painting begun at Mr. Lanctot's?—A. I cannot say exactly.

Q. Was it in the course of the summer of 1910?—A. Oh, I am rather disposed to suspect it was more in the autumn. I am not sure.

Q. Did you go into the house of Mr. Lanctot?—A. About every day, I did.

Q. The carpenters and joiners who are mentioned in exhibits 35, 36 and 37 according to you, worked in the house of Mr. Lanctot until the month of November?—A. Not all. There was an interruption for the time when they worked at the other job.

Q. But if they came back afterwards to work at the house of Mr. Lanctot?—A. They came back afterwards.

Q. And the painting only began after they were through?—A. As I said; I am not sure when it began. I am not sure.

Q. You would not positively swear as to the paint in Mr. Lanctot's house? You were keeping the time of your father's men, the carpenters?—A. I had nothing at all to do with the painters.

Q. Do you know the men who are mentioned in Exhibit No. 35?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know them personally?—A. I saw them working for my father.

Q. In the second list, the one finishing on September 1, 1910, I find the name of one, H. Paul, who worked two days and a half. Do you know this one?—A. H. Paul?

Q. Yes. This one is Henri Paul?—A. I do not know his first name. H. Paul and A. Paul, that is the same thing, but this one is only an apprentice.

Q. You see it is the account for carpenters' and joiners' work done at the house of Adelard Lanctot for a term which ended on August 18, and for another term which ended on September 1, 1910?—A. One term finishing on the 18th of the month of August, yes.

Q. Do you swear that the painting at Adélard Lanctot's did not begin before that?—A. I told you a few moments ago: I am not sure; I am not sure of the time at which it began.

Witness discharged.

OMER ANGERS sworn.

By Mr. Laflamme:

Q. In the fall of 1909 were you requested by Mr. Lanctot to do some work around his house, and if so what?—A. I cannot exactly remember if it was in 1909. I think it was in 1910.

Q. You think it was in 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. On George street?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Very well, I made a mistake, 1910. What was it?—A. There was a telephone pole in front Mr. Lanctot's door. He wanted it removed so that the entrance would be easier. So I told him I could remove it, but I had no men. I asked Mr. Lanctot if he could procure me some men I could do it, and so he did.

Q. Whom did he procure?—A. He got two men to work for me.

Q. Who were these two men?—A. I don't exactly remember the names of the two, but I know there was one named Gouin.

Q. Do you remember another by the name of Kain?—A. I think I heard of him.

Q. How long did Gouin assist you to remove the pole?—A. Just a day—one afternoon on the first day, and the afternoon of the next day.

Q. How long did Kain work if?—A. He worked the same time.

By Mr. McDougall:

Q. You say one of these men's name was Kain?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the other one?—A. Gouin.

Q. Will you look at Exhibit '2'? What time was it that Mr. Lanctot asked you to get men to have this unsightly telephone pole removed?—A. I cannot exactly tell you the date, but I believe it was in September.

Q. 1910?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you look at Exhibit '2' please and say whether you refer to Avila Gouin and Adelard Kain, whose names you see there?—A. I cannot say that it was Avila Gouin or Adelard Kain. I know they were Gouin and Kain.

Q. One named Gouin and the other Kain were sent to you?—A. He told me he would take him with him.

Q. Who sent them?—A. They were there when I got there.

Q. Do you know where they came from?—A. I believe they came from the government.

Q. From the government shipyard?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were those men ordinary labourers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They helped you to remove the telephone pole?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you have to send to the government ship-yard for men to help you to remove a telephone pole?—A. Not for every job. It was Mr. Lanctot's job. It is not my habit to get government men for my own work.

Q. But labourers could have been got in Sorel?—A. I do not know whether there was any or not. I could not get them myself. If I could have got them I would not have asked Mr. Lanctot for some.

Witness discharged.

Committee adjourned till 3 o'clock.

3 o'clock, p.m.

JOSEPH EDMOND GAUTHIER, SWORN.

By Mr. N. K. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Gauthier?—A. No. 354 Champlain street, Montreal.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am manager of the paint department at Castle & Son's.

Q. In Montreal?—A. In Montreal.

Q. How many years' experience have you had in that time?—A. About twenty-two years.

Q. Did you do any painting work in Ottawa?—A. Yes, sir, we painted Mr. Fitzpatrick's house,

2 GEORGE V., A. 1912.

Q. Then?—A. We painted the dining room at Rideau Hall; we did the work at the Rideau Club, on Wellington street, and we did some work at the Russell.

Q. Mr. Gauthier, have you recently examined Mr. Adelard Lanctot's house in Sorel; and if so, when, and for what purpose?—A. I went and examined Mr. Lanctot's house in Sorel.

Q. For what purpose?—A. It was in order to see how the work had been done and how much it might have cost to do it.

Q. Did you come to a conclusion?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was that conclusion?—A. After having carefully examined the work—I examined the house room by room—I came to the conclusion that, from the manner in which the work had been done, and from my experience and the quality of the work done there, that work might have been done in about two hundred days.

Q. What is your total estimate of the work?—A. I make it out \$461.

Q. This would include the work and the materials?—A. The work and the materials with the exception of the cost of the glass which I have not included in that estimate.

Q. Is this estimate the price that you would have charged, yourself, as contractor?—A. No, sir; it is the amount which it would have cost my employer to do the job.

Q. Does that mean that it would include the profit?—A. No, no; there is no profit there.

Cross-examined by Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. What profit would you expect to make?—A. As to the profit, that is none of my business; my employer might have included whatever he liked as a profit. He might have taken 10 per cent or 15 per cent.

Q. Now as to the window panes, how much would you add?—A. The panes might have cost from fifty to sixty dollars.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. The panes themselves?—A. The panes themselves, and the time for glazing is included in that.

By Mr. McDougall, K.C.:

Q. What price would you add for the time of men?—A. I would add \$1.75 per day; the average is about \$1.75.

Q. Was it the price in Sorel?—A. Yes, I believe they might be had at that price in Sorel.

Q. Did you inquire whether or not this was the price at Sorel?—A. I inquired, and from what I know, I think that we might get the men to do the work which has been done because it was not first class work.

Q. How much do you pay your men here?—A. Here we pay from twenty-five to thirty-five cents per hour.

Q. And how many hours do they work a day?—A. Nine hours. But it is not the same thing in Sorel as in Montreal. Men cannot be had for the same price.

Q. Why is it not the same thing?—A. Because the work done in Sorel cannot be compared with the work which is done in Montreal, with the work done by the firm of Castle & Son.

Q. And I suppose the painters are numerous in Sorel. It is not very hard to find painters in Sorel, at that price?—A. I do not think it would be difficult; there should be some, because Sorel is not a large city. I believe it ought to be easy to find painters there.

Q. You say that 200 days at \$1.75 per day would about represent the cost of the work?—A. Yes.

Q. At how much do you estimate the materials?—A. About \$110.

APPENDIX No. 3

Q. Does this include the glass?—A. No, sir.

Q. How much would you allow for the glass?—A. The panes of glass might cost about fifty or sixty dollars.

Witness discharged.

ADELARD LANCTOT, M.P., recalled.

By Mr. Laflamme, K.C.:

Q. Who paid for the panes of glass which were put in the windows of your house on George street?—A. It was me.

Mr. J. M. McDougall, K.C., states that he has no questions to put to the witness.

⊕

EVIDENCE

TAKEN BY THE

MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

RESPECTING

CLAUSE 10, CHAP. 61, 9-10 EDWARD VII, "AN ACT
RESPECTING THE WATER CARRIAGE OF GOODS"

THIRD SESSION, ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT



OTTAWA

PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST
EXCELLENT MAJESTY

1912

ORDER OF THE HOUSE.

(V. & P. p. 769)

FRIDAY, 7th April, 1911.

On motion of Mr. Brodeur, it was Ordered,—

That in view of the complaints made concerning the Clause 10 of the "Water-Carriage of Goods Act," the said complaints be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries for investigation.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE.

(V. & P. p. 847).

MONDAY, 1st May, 1911.

Mr. Sinclair, from the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries, presented the Second Report of the said Committee which is as follows:—

Your Committee recommend that the evidence being taken in connection with Section 10, Chapter 61, 1909-10 Edward VII., an Act respecting the Water-Carriage of Goods, be printed from day to day, and that Rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

(V. & P. p. 867)

THURSDAY, 4th May, 1911.

Mr. Sinclair, from the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries, presented the Third Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

Your Committee recommend that leave be granted to them to sit while the House is in Session.

THURSDAY, 4th May, 1911.

Ordered,—That leave be granted to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries to sit while the House is in session, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the Third Report of the said Committee.

Attest.

(Sgd.) THOMAS B. FLINT,
Clerk, House of Commons.

(V. & P. p. 915).

WEDNESDAY, 10th May, 1911.

Mr. Sinclair, from the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries, presented the Fourth Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

In obedience to the Order of the House of 7th April, 1911, your Committee have had under consideration the complaints made concerning clause 10 of the "Water-Carriage of Goods Act," and have agreed to recommend that a Bill be passed during the present Session amending chapter 61 of the Statutes of 1909-10 as follows:—

Paragraph (a) of Section 2 to be repealed and the following substituted therefor: "(a) 'goods' includes, wares, merchandise and articles of any kind whatsoever except that it does not include live animals or lumber, deals and other articles usually described as 'wood goods'".

Section 10 to be struck out.

Your Committee also herewith submit the Evidence taken in connection with the aforesaid clause 10 for the information of the House.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

COMMITTEE ROOM No. 32.

OTTAWA, Thursday, April 27, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries met at eleven o'clock, a.m., the Chairman, Mr. J. H. Sinclair, presiding, and proceeded to the consideration of complaints in reference to clause 10, chapter 61, 9-10 Edward VII, 'An Act respecting the water carriage of goods.'

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, the business before the committee this morning is the consideration of clause 10 of the Water Carriage of Goods Act, passed last session. There is a petition which has been referred to the Committee asking for the repeal of this clause which reads as follows:

'10. In case of wood goods, notwithstanding anything in the charter party, bill of lading, or other shipping document, the owner, charterer, master or agent of the ship, or the ship itself, shall only be bound to deliver to the consignee the pieces received from the shipper, and shall not be held responsible for deficiency in measurement; and any words inserted in any charter party, bill of lading, or other shipping document for the purpose of making the owner, charterer, master or agent of the ship, or the ship itself, liable for deficiency in measurement in such case shall be illegal, null and void and of no effect.'

I understand there are some witnesses to be heard this morning, will we call them now?

HON. MR. BRODEUR.—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.—We will call Mr. Taylor.

MR. F. R. TAYLOR, St. John.—I am not a witness, I am the solicitor, and if it is in accordance with the practice of this committee I will say a few words as to the principle we are contending for before asking the witnesses to give evidence.

MR. MCKENZIE.—The better practice will be to call the witnesses first and hear the address of counsel afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think we had better call the witnesses first.

MR. KYTE.—We had considerable evidence given before the Committee last year respecting this Bill, which evidence was printed, and I would like to move that the evidence taken before the Committee this year in reference to clause 10, which is before us, be printed for the information of the members of the House and of this Committee.

Motion adopted.

Mr. J. FRASER GREGORY, called and sworn.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. You are in the lumber business in the city of St. John?—A. I am a manufacturer of lumber.

Q. About what is the quantity you cut each year?—A. Of logs or deals?

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Q. Logs?—A. My cutting of logs is about 30,000,000.

Q. And your mill is at St. John, New Brunswick?—A. In St. John, New Brunswick; it does not manufacture that quantity, 12,000,000 is my manufacturing quantity.

Q. And your manufactured lumber is shipped largely to the United Kingdom?—A. Yes.

Q. What has been the practice in St. John in the past to your knowledge as to bills of lading given by vessels, that is until this Act was passed?—A. The way to answer that question is that as a manufacturer of lumber we sell to a shipper in St. John, who, in turn, is the shipper. I am not to any great extent a shipper of lumber to the United Kingdom. I only know in a casual way what the practice is.

Q. You know what the practice has been for a good many years?—A. I know what the practice was.

Q. What has the practice been for a number of years?—A. Under a civic by-law a number of surveyors were examined and licensed every year, they are appointed by the city. They make the measurements as between the manufacturer and the shipper, or the purchaser, we are at liberty to put on a surveyor to check, if we feel so inclined, but in general practice the measurement made by the sworn surveyor is accepted as final between the parties.

Q. What is the charge of the surveyor?—A. Five cents a thousand.

Q. That is the usual standard rate?—A. That is the standard rate.

Q. Who pays the surveyor?—A. The shipper pays the surveyor.

Q. These surveyors are appointed under a general statute of the province?—A. Well, it is under the general statute of the province for the survey and exportation of lumber, and it is regulated by the city by-laws.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. What Act is that, can you give us the exact statute?

Mr. TAYLOR.—It is under the Act relating to the surveying and exportation of lumber, Revised Statutes of New Brunswick.

Q. When was that Act passed?—A. I really could not say, but it was re-passed when the statutes were revised.

Mr. TAYLOR.—It has been on the statute book since before confederation, and it has been re-enacted at each revision of the statutes since that date.

Q. You have not the exact date at which it was passed?

Mr. TAYLOR.—The original Act was passed before confederation, but it is in the Consolidated Statutes, the last time it was re-enacted was in 1903.

The CHAIRMAN.—What chapter is it?

Mr. TAYLOR.—Chapter 96.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. Now, Mr. Gregory, will you please state what effect clause 10, of the existing Act has on the lumber business in New Brunswick?

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Before you go into that would it not be possible to give a general idea of the Act, it would be of assistance if Mr. Gregory could tell us the general nature of the Act.—A. The general nature of that Act that you have in your hand, and the Act that is in force to-day in New Brunswick is that it clearly sets out the different classes of deals and timber, how many knots and how much waste is allowable, the different classes, first, second and third class, and then it provides for the survey between the parties, that the survey must be made by an independent person who has no interest whatever in the lumber that is being surveyed. That is the practice and intention of the Act. Of course attached to it is a scale for logs and the details by which we work out the measurement of the logs and the timber is included.

APPENDIX No. 4

Q. Is there any classification of the lumber itself?—A. As to grading?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes, the grading of the lumber is included.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. The Act provides that no lumber shall be exported until surveyed by a sworn surveyor?—A. Yes.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. So that the surveyor does not only determine the superficial quantity in feet, but grades also the qualities?—A. He makes the qualities irrespective of what grading has been done by the manufacturer. He grades the lumber and measures it. Now you asked me as to the effect of this clause—

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. Before you leave that, that survey is accepted as between yourself and the purchaser and shipper, is it?—A. As final.

Q. Is that also accepted on the other side as conclusive, as to quantity?—A. It has been under the old Act, yes.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. If it suits them to accept it they do so, but if it does not they do not accept it?—A. I beg pardon, when I say it is accepted on the other side, it is accepted in many instances, yet at the same time, when a cargo is being discharged on the other side a survey is sometimes made, and in this first instance of shipping it would without doubt be made. If there is any loss in the bills of lading the vessels usually pay for it. Have I made myself clear there?

Q. I was not speaking so much on the question of the bill of lading and the loss by the vessel as to the quality of the goods. You have no legal status on your goods over there. If the receiver accepts your survey, well and good, but if he does not accept that as a guarantee of the quality at all, you have no legal status as far as the quality of your survey is concerned?—A. No.

By Hon. Mr. Baird:

Q. How do they find out if there is any loss?—A. On the other side?

Q. How do they find out if there is any loss in shipping unless scale is made?—

A. There is no way of finding out any loss unless a survey is made on the other side.

Q. You cannot find out what is the loss?—A. No. I think if I were to outline the whole idea it would probably prevent some questions being asked. In the ordinary course of business, gentlemen, a manufacturer in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia sells to a shipper, or to a purchaser of lumber, more or less, and from time to time vessels come in to carry it away. At the time they come in the deals are sent from the different mills to the ship. Each and every lighter load is measured at the mill, or as it comes off the cars or in lighters beside the steamer, by sworn and competent surveyors, who have no interest whatever in the lumber. The shipper puts different items together. The survey for such lumber as has gone into the vessel is made at each mill and the lighter has to be moved from each mill to the vessel in the harbour, a distance of less than two miles, and goes alongside the vessel. The shipper puts these various specifications or bills of lumber, together and makes one whole of it that he calls his cargo sheet. When the cargo is completed the captain signs a bill of lading for his pieces in quantity, and the vessel goes forward. It is re-tallied or re-surveyed on the other side possibly, if it is a new shipper, and the people are strangers. We know it is re-surveyed at Manchester and some other ports; it is taken in charge by dockmen and must be re-surveyed. If there is a shortage it is chargeable to the steamer. Now the ship has accepted the surveyor's account in St. John, or the surveyor's tally, for the simple reason that in practice they have found this account correct and the mistakes or errors were less than the cost of mak-

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

ing a survey for themselves which would amount to five cents the thousand. Therefore in practice there has not been very much re-surveyed of the lumber when it was received by the vessel. The vessel has a perfect right to make the survey and should do so. If she neglects to make the survey it is their own loss; the loss certainly should be theirs. In actual practice lumber that is moved from the mills to the vessels in lighters is raised over the side of the vessel in slings. Delivery has been made to the vessel when the lumber has come within the reach of the ship's tackle and lines have been thrown out and the scow has been moored alongside the vessel. Then the vessel's stevedores take charge of it, take it out of the lighters and put it into the hold. If in handling it from the lighter to the vessel pieces are dropped out of the slings and go into the water and are allowed to float away there is certainly a loss, but the loss is the ship's loss and is due to carelessness on the part of the ship in loading and not the fault of the shipper. If the section stands as it is there is a premium put on carelessness: the ship does not take care of the pieces as it should, after being received, and is not as careful as she should be.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. If the sticks are on the scow when it comes alongside and the vessel accepts that lumber, and pieces are dropped afterwards, is it not the ship's lookout?—A. It should be the ship's lookout, it has been in the past the ship's lookout.

Q. Must it not be? You say that when you furnish your scow alongside the vessel there are so many sticks on that scow?—A. Yes.

Q. They have to accept that and if they lose a stick after that they must account for it, must they not? The law now is that the ship is only responsible for the number of pieces, that is the law now under section 10.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. Which they tally on board ship, which goes on board ship.—A. Which goes on board ship as it comes alongside the vessel in lighters.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. The moment you furnish your scow and she has ten thousand pieces, you would say: 'Here is a scow with 10,000 pieces'. They accept that, don't they, it is in their possession then?—A. Yes.

Q. But if they lose a stick in getting it on board that is their loss and not yours?—A. It may be their loss, but there are sticks of different sizes and dimensions going aboard, and unfortunately a certain number of pieces may become broken—where you would have an increased number of pieces, or the same number of pieces, but a less quantity. That is the reason we say what the quantity should be. The practice is that in taking a sling on board the vessel there are various sizes. There will be small pieces of scantling and in the same sling a large deal, 11 by 3. In going up the 11 by 3 goes overboard; the heaviest piece has slipped out, and the 2 by 3 is landed and possibly broken. When the sling has come on the deck of the vessel there are two pieces of 2 by 3, because the small piece was broken going on board the vessel while the 11 by 3 piece has gone with the tide. You have got your right number of pieces but you have lost in feet. That is what works out in practice. That bill of pieces is not sufficient, although inadvertently the pieces are increased in the transportation of the lumber.

By Mr. Kyte:

Q. The pieces broken would not be very apparent to the persons taking it—A. the Act does not say it must be pieces of the dimensions that went on board, it simply says 'pieces'.

APPENDIX No. 4

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. The bill of lading distinctly states that the goods must be delivered in the shape in which they are received.—A. The bill of lading has that condition.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. It will help things if we understand you as you go along. What I was asking you a question about was, you stated yourself that delivery consisted in taking charge of the scow by the ship?—A. Yes.

Q. You stated afterwards that the sticks could be broken?—A. The number of pieces could be increased.

Q. But if two broken pieces are substituted for a whole piece delivered to a vessel when you come to deliver up this cargo would it not be apparent, does the bill of lading not only say the number of sticks but the sizes of the different sticks?—A. If you will give us that, that is all we ask for, because the moment you give the sizes of the different sticks then we have the specification, and that is all we ask for.

Q. I think you should have that?—A. I think so too, and now gentlemen, I just want to get away from this, I cannot answer these questions in reference to receiving on the other side as well as some other gentlemen who are here, and I would like to be relieved of that. Now, gentlemen, if you will allow me to talk in my own way for a minute or two that is what I would like to do. The point is with reference to this bill of lading under section 10, that it seeks only to give the number of pieces in the vessel. I have tried to tell the committee as nearly as I can what the practice has been and what happened in the actual working out, and how the lumber is taken from the mills on to the lighter, and from the lighters into the vessels, and I have shown that in that operation the number of pieces were increased. Now we ask that the quantity as well as the number of pieces, or the dimensions of the pieces, which is the same thing, be a part of the bill of lading; that is that the evidence of delivery to the vessel is conclusive at the time delivery is made. If I understand correctly the object of our coming here together it is to facilitate the lumber business of Canada and to make some general rule which will not in any way hamper trade and which will be beneficial to the citizens, and to the shippers of Canada. That is what we are here for. As the old bill of lading stood we had no cause whatever to complain, we were selling our goods to the shippers in St. John on the sworn survey of an independent surveyor and we accepted that, they paid us for them on that survey. The shippers passed that survey on to the vessel and it was final and binding. That bill of lading was final and binding evidence as to the quantity of lumber that had been delivered to the vessel and was a negotiable banking document. Now it is not that and the lumber people of the United Kingdom have absolutely refused to accept this bill of lading; there are gentlemen here who will tell you that on account of the action taken at certain meetings of the Lumber Federation on the other side we were absolutely handicapped in our business, and we cannot sell a stick of lumber to-day without the quality being guaranteed by the shipper or by the manufacturer. It is an unique position we are in, and it is one that is very hard on the trade of Canada. We must have some evidence, at some point, that is conclusive, that the lumber has been delivered to the vessel. We cannot follow that lumber to the ends of the earth. As it is now we are only getting a bill for the pieces, without any specification as to the size of the pieces and the manufacturer has to guarantee to the shipper, and the shipper has to guarantee to the purchaser in Australia, England, South Africa, anywhere and everywhere, all the time, we have to guarantee as against the ship. The shipper has to be responsible for carelessness in the management of the ship, for lumber lost inadvertently, pieces may disappear, but he is responsible. That should not be. There should be some point in Canada at which we can get a final bill of lading, an absolute document as to the amount of lumber we have shipped; we should not be required

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

to follow it to the ends of the earth, and this government should not ask Canadian citizens to follow lumber to the ends of the earth and be responsible for delivery in Australia, for instance. That is what this section asks us to do. Now I cannot see that it is a reasonable proposition; we want to protect the Canadian shipper, that is what this committee is for, and let us have a clean bill of lading, let us have the ship sign for the number of pieces of certain dimensions when the vessel leaves Canada and not ask the Canadian shipper to take the risk of following that lumber to the ends of the earth.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. I would, as a member of the committee, be with you as to the dimensions being given. If a stick is 20 feet long by 6 by 4, there is no difficulty in requiring the vessel to accept the superficial contents of that stick; but I am told that there is no uniform standard of measurement.—A. Oh, there is an absolute standard in sawn lumber.

Q. Yes, in your district?—A. No, in the whole world. A superficial foot of lumber is 12 inches square and one inch thick.

Q. I have been told that if the sawing is not absolutely straight and correct, that it is the smaller parts of the stick that is measured in some parts of the country.—

A. We would assume that lumber for export is decently manufactured.

Q. That is the only difficulty that I, as one member of the Committee, could see?—A. I will tell you, if you have a stick 20 feet long, 6 inches by 4 inches, a piece of lumber 6 inches wide and 4 inches thick has 24 square inches in every foot, so that a stick of timber of that dimension, 20 feet long would have 40 superficial feet in the piece. If you have the size and the number of the piece you have the quantity. There is no difficulty in any part of the globe in making up the quantity if you have the sizes and the dimensions.

Q. As one member of the Committee I do think you are entitled to the dimensions of every stick?—A. That is all we ask.

By Mr. Daniel:

Q. You propose to simply place on the ship owner the expense of the re-survey? —A. Yes—if you will allow me I would like to answer that question a little more fully, Mr. Daniel. On whose head should it fall but the shipowner's, he is getting what he is asking, the cost of the re-survey is 5 cents a thousand. In the chartering of vessels by the lumber trade you make an offer to a vessel for a cargo of deals; that vessel is seeking for the best business she can get, grain, cotton, all sorts and kinds of business. The shipowner figures up what offers he gets, he calculates the particular charges on the different classes of cargo offering, he figures up the probable losses he will have to pay on the various cargoes and all that sort of thing. He takes into consideration the conditions of carrying in the lumber trade, and if he accept a lumber charter he accepts it because it is the best charter offering under the conditions that he has had in the past. He knows what is there, that he gives a clean bill of lading and must pay any shortage that there is on the other side. He has allowed for his survey and has accepted it. He has allowed for tallying, making a special survey for himself. If he has not it is because he has decided that is the best charter he can get. However, he has allowed for making a survey of his lumber to put it on board. Then if he neglects to do so why should we be up against it; I cannot see it at all. We should get a clean bill of lading before the stuff leaves Canada. We should, as Canadian citizens, when this lumber leaves this country in a foreign bottom, have a clean receipt for what they take.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. You are speaking now particularly of goods leaving Canada in foreign bottoms?—A. Yes.

APPENDIX No. 4

Q. But if the goods leave in a Canadian bottom don't you want to have that Canadian in the same position that you are?—A. If my brother took the goods I would want to have a clean bill of lading.

Q. Suppose a ship receives a cargo from you and makes a tally of the pieces which go on board?—A. Yes.

Q. The tally of the mate of that ship, or the purser, or whoever he may be, agrees with yours and the ship takes that cargo of goods and delivers them in Europe or Africa, or anywhere you like, and they tally the pieces out just the same as when they were taken in, is that not satisfactory to the shipper?—A. If they tally them out.

Q. Suppose when they get to the receiver of the cargo the ship again puts her purser, or the mate, or whoever has charge of the cargo, to tally the cargo and the receiver tallies the cargo also, and they deliver the same number of pieces on the other side as have been taken in; would not that be satisfactory to the shipper?—A. That would be satisfactory if the tallies turned out identical.

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you through, Mr. Gregory?—A. I think I am unless there is anything else to be asked.

By Mr. Kyle:

Q. Does the shipper take any record of the specification himself?—A. The shipper?

Q. Yes.—A. Yes, every item of it the shipper takes.

Q. Which he forwards to the consignee?—A. He does in ordinary course, that is called the cargo sheet.

Q. There is a record of the dimensions kept by the shipper?—A. Yes.

Q. Then if the captain of the vessel delivers the number of pieces, but not the identical pieces, and action is brought against the vessel, those who tallied the number as it went on board and made the specification could, I suppose, furnish that to sustain the action against the shipowner.—A. If section 10 will waive pieces of the same description and kind that went on board, we do not want that section to come out.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. As against the Act the words of the charter party or bill of lading cannot prevail?—A. No, there is a penalty, if you insist, in the Act there. If you insist on the Act for pieces of certain dimensions.

By Mr. Fraser:

Q. Are you a shipper of lumber yourself?—A. I am not. I am a manufacturer. I do ship but not any great quantity.

Q. Are you aware of any reason why this clause was put in the Act last year?—A. We have a full knowledge we believe, of how it got into the Act. Our solicitor will deal with that.

Q. Was it intended to protect the ship-owner, do you think?—A. We believe that it was.

Q. You believe that it was intended to protect the ship-owner?—A. I believe so. Although the Bill was brought in as a Bill for the protection of shippers, yet this clause was inserted in the Bill at a very late stage, which was antagonistic to the shippers.

Q. Have you ever had any trouble under the old Act with the lumber that you shipped away?—A. We had no trouble.

Q. Have you had any trouble since this Act came into force?—A. There has been considerable trouble. If you will permit him, the next witness is going to tell you of the trouble experienced.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Q. Can you tell us any troubles of your own knowledge?—A. I know of no troubles of my own knowledge, but the season is only opening, you must bear in mind.

By Mr. Daniel:

Q. Before you sit down can you give us an idea of the amount of loss which is occasioned in a cargo, say of the size of the—A. That is not within my department, Mr. McKean will answer that much better than I could.

Q. I want to find out about the losses from lumber falling overboard.—A. Mr. McKean could answer that much better than I could.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. I understand you wrote this memorandum which has been distributed?—A. I was one of the men interested in writing it. I made the final draft.

Q. If I understand you, Mr. Gregory, you preferred the situation before the Campbell Act was passed, or to give the Act its correct title, the Water Carriage of Goods Act, rather than now?—A. Yes.

Q. In other words you were one of those who would rather not have any Act restraining the liberty of contract between the shipper and the ship-owner.—A. We would like to have made our own contracts.

Q. Then why did you not come up here when the ship-owner was trying to defend himself and representing that he did not want the Campbell Act? Why did you not come up and help the shippers to get the very thing that you are trying to get now?—A. My own personal business prevented me from coming at that time, and I have had to come here to-day at very considerable personal inconvenience to myself owing to the spring driving, and so on.

Q. Is it not a fact that four years before the Campbell Act—we call it the Campbell Act, but strictly speaking, the Water Carriage of Goods Act—was passed in 1910, neither the Allans, nor the Canadian Pacific boats, nor any of the large boats, would give any bill of lading, accepting your measurements, they would only give it for pieces? Isn't that true?—A. I cannot say that accurately. Mr. McKean will answer that much better than I can.

Witness discharged.

Mr. GEORGE McKEAN, called and sworn:

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. You are in the lumber business in St. John?—A. Yes.

Q. How long have you been in the business?—A. I have been in the lumber business since Confederation, or two months after, that is since 1867.

Q. How long has the old 'conclusive evidence' clause been in existence?—A. It has been in existence from that time up to September last.

Q. Will you please tell the committee what effect the present section 10, had upon the lumber trade?—A. The effect of the present Act on the lumber trade has been to draw together the buyers of lumber on the other side, they declare they will not buy lumber unless a guarantee is given that the quantity in the bill of lading will be given to them as stated in the Bill.

Q. This is a copy of the resolution which was passed on the other side, I believe, Mr. McKean?—A. Well, of course, it was sent out to me as a copy of the resolution that was passed, I cannot say whether or not it was passed, I wasn't there.

Q. But it was sent to you as a copy?—A. Yes.

APPENDIX No. 4

(Document filed as follows):

(Copy).

THE INCORPORATED BRISTOL CHANNEL TIMBER IMPORTERS'
ASSOCIATION.

BRISTOL, March 28, 1911.

MESSRS. F. & J.

DEAR SIRS,—Your letter of the 13th instant signed jointly by the other spruce agents and brokers, was laid before a meeting of the Executive of this association yesterday afternoon, when the members regretted they were unable to depart from their former decision, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

That this meeting having received the reply dated March 13th from the spruce agents in Liverpool and London dealing with the matter of the Canadian Water Carriage of Goods Act, hereby adheres to its former resolution and unanimously resolves not to purchase any spruce cargoes unless a personal guarantee is first given by the shippers' agent to the effect that any shortage in measure not recoverable from the shipowner or underwriter shall be made good.

We are, faithfully yours,

[Signed.] HILLIAR & PITT,

Secretaries.

Q. What effect does this have upon the shippers of lumber?—A. The effect it would have, if that is carried out, would be that the shipper of lumber, when shipping over there would have to follow the vessel in order to see that no lumber was stolen and that the whole cargo was carefully delivered. That is, lumber is taken from vessels in various ways, in scows, I am speaking of delivery on the other side, or lighters rather, they do not call them scows there, it is put into railway carriages and wagons, and the party who ships it from New Brunswick would have to follow it up in order to see that nothing was stolen or given away, and that none of it was lost.

Q. Have you made any estimate of the cost of the checking the lumber on delivery at the port of destination?—A. Well, we couldn't get at the cost of it, but in Liverpool where it was done some years ago, and when it was done there the cost was 3 s. 6 d. per standard, that would be 42 cents per thousand.

Q. That would be the cost to the Canadian shipper, 42 cents?—A. To the manufacturer, because it would come back to the manufacturer.

Q. What is the cost of surveying the lumber in Canada by a sworn surveyor?—The cost in St. John is now 5 cents.

Q. And in other places I suppose it is the same?—A. Yes.

Q. There is a difference then of 37 cents?—A. Yes, certainly.

Q. Has any trade been built up between Canada and South Africa and Australia?—A. It has.

Q. And the Act applies to those countries as well?—A. It does.

Q. Would it be practical at all to check delivery from the ship in those places?—A. No. I have three cargoes for Australia on hand at present and it would be hardly possible for me in the ordinary course of trade to send a man out to Melbourne to have it checked as it is put over the side of the ship at Melbourne. I have another one in Adelaide, but it is practically impossible to carry out that suggestion, the trade would have to be abandoned if that were necessary.

Q. Has any other country producing wood goods any such legislation as this?—A. None that I am aware of.

Q. You know of no other country in the world?—A. None in the world.

Q. Canada stands alone in this respect?—A. She does.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Q. And Canada, you say, stands at a disadvantage of 42 cents per thousand as compared with other countries engaged in the lumber trade by reason of this Act?—

A. Simply because of the difficulties that would arise in carrying this out.

Q. At the present time there is no control over the goods from the time they are delivered to the ship until the time the consignee gets them?—A. No, they are in charge of the captain.

Q. What do you say about the clause as to the number of pieces, what is the effect of that?—A. I would have to go back a little bit in explanation of that. It is the custom of the trade, and the custom of the port, for the ship to tally her cargo in, and it has been the invariable custom of the port since I have been in the trade—when I first entered the trade it was customary for the brokers to send a surveyor to tally the deals against my surveyor. By and by they came to me and said, well, Mr. McKean, you are a shipper of deals that you are buying from Baker, Bond, Cushing and various mills, and it is a waste of money for us to put on a surveyor to tally against your man, you have a good man and we will sign a clean bill of lading, taking your count. That went until this time, virtually, it was merely a saving to the ship of 5 cents per thousand, a charge which the shipowner had a perfect right to pay. It was always the custom with the trade and a great many ships would not accept our count, but put on their own surveyor, and it is the recognized custom of the port. There is no difficulty whatever for any ordinarily intelligent man taking a count of the cargo going on board the ship, because every piece of deal is marked in accordance with the Law, according to its size, 20 feet, by 8 by 3, or whatever the size is so clearly that anybody can read it. It is perfectly true that the officers of the ship could not take these marks, and the officers of a steamer never took them in my experience, and the consequence is they hire sworn surveyors to take it for them. At any rate it is their privilege to hire the sworn surveyor to take the tally for them. All we ask them to do is to put on their sworn surveyor and we will take the count, and the sworn surveyor has the right to say what quantity has been delivered. That has been the custom at St. John and every port in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and that has been the practice up to this.

Q. And that sworn surveyor is appointed under the statutes of the province?—A. He is appointed under the statutes of the province, and is examined by the Municipal Council and I have had sworn surveyors tell me that they had a great deal of difficulty in getting through that examination.

Q. There is a penalty provided under the Act, is there not?—A. Yes, and they are under bonds for \$200, I think, and they have also taken out a license from year to year, so that they are sworn from year to year.

Q. Would this Act in your opinion, Mr. McKean, have any effect upon the care exercised by the ship in checking the losses?—A. Well, the ship, if she signs a clean bill of lading, has to look after what she gets. Now, as a matter of fact nearly every steamer that goes from St. John, or from any other port on this side when she gets over to the other side has to pay claims for loss. The steamer invariably pays the claim; every ship since I have been in the trade always pays the claim because there are a certain number of deals that are stolen, lost, or broken in one way and another. Steamship owners who charter these steamers know these claims arise and they pay these claims because they are competing for business against other ports. And when the owner takes that business he does so knowing that there will be a claim, and the ordinary steamship owner is well posted as to the amount the claim will be under ordinary circumstances. Under extraordinary circumstances if the ship is careless in taking on her cargo, or if she loads it very rapidly and dumps the stuff overboard she has to pay for it.

Q. You say that is included in the freight charge?—A. It is invariably.

Q. Suppose the cargo is lost overboard through stress of weather, the ship usually notes a protest on the other side.—A. If the ship loses any cargo we do not look to it at all, but to our insurance. She has enough to do to make her protest.

APPENDIX No. 4

Q. The effect of this legislation then would be to make a ship less careful of the cargo and less likely to note a protest in case of small loss.—A. I do not know what the effect of the legislation will be, you cannot tell, unless you follow it until you deliver it on the other side. It is tying up the trade of the province and is going to cost New Brunswick not less than \$120,000, and will cost Nova Scotia not less than half that amount.

Q. It will cost the province of New Brunswick \$120,000 and the province of Nova Scotia not less than \$60,000 a year.—A. A year.

Q. Is there anything else you would like to say on this matter? If there is the committee will hear you.—A. Well, I don't know, unless some gentleman has a question to ask me.

By Mr. Daniel:

Q. Can you tell me what proportion of loss occurs in loading a ship, say a steamer of 2,000 tons carrying a cargo of 1,500 tons of lumber—have you any idea of how much would be lost in the loading by breakage and loss of deals out of the slings, and that sort of thing?—A. I have not, Mr. Daniel, but the underwriters insure for small loss, a certain quantity. Now, I went down, just after this arrangement, to look at the *Indrani*, one of the Donaldson line steamers, loading in St. John. She was dropping deals overboard more or less and there was a quantity of them in the water that had dropped out of the sling. I saw deals drop out of the slings whilst I was there and I was not there more than five minutes. In case you load a steamer night and day you will lose a great deal more. It depends greatly on the stevedore whether he piles his deals well or not, but every steamer and every sailing ship loses more or less.

Q. There is no attempt made to recover these deals?—A. Well, any ordinary steamship owner knows that there will be a loss and he calculates upon it when he makes his charges. When he makes his charges it is a question with him what he can get from New York, or from Savannah, or from Mobile, and the calculations made for loss. Vessels loading down at Mobile lose frequently pieces of wood. Now another thing I was just going to say—

Q. That loss falls upon the manufacturer of the lumber?—A. Another point I wish to speak about is this. It was raised a few minutes ago by one of the gentlemen present, referring to the liners requiring from us a bill of lading in which they will acknowledge nothing but the number of pieces. When a liner loads a cargo such as the *Indrani* is loading now, she signs a bill of lading in the ordinary form that the ordinary tramp steamer signs and that every other steamer signs. When they come and say: 'We want 75 standards for filling up stuff, and will take it from you at 25 shillings a standard,' we may accept that and give her the number of pieces and take our own responsibility as to whether she delivers them right or not. The liners, as well as the others where they go out to load the whole cargo, invariably do that. Another thing, our friends in Europe say: 'Is it right for the Canadian government to make a law that we in England cannot charter a steamer and go out to Canada and have the 'conclusive evidence' clause in our bill of lading,' because the Canada Water Carriage Act stifles the conclusive evidence clause.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. Did you know anything about this section 10 until the Act had been passed?—A. I never heard of it in my life and never thought that people would have passed such an Act, because it seems a monstrous thing to me that I cannot make a bargain with the steamer when I am wholly and solely loading on her to carry anything, except contraband of war, under any terms and conditions that the steamship owner is willing to make with me.

Q. The lumber trade generally did not know anything about that amendment?—A. As far as the lumber trade is concerned I do not believe there is a lumber shipper in New Brunswick that knew anything of it.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. You must have known that a Bill was being brought in by the Hon. Mr. Campbell, because there were any number of gentlemen up from the lower provinces then, the sole effect of which was to do away with the right of a ship owner to contract with a merchant?—A. The truth of the matter is, I did not, and I do not think the shippers generally did. Mr. Porter was up here. He represented William Thompson & Company, and William Thompson & Company represent a very large number of liners. I do not know who else there was but I do not think there was anybody representing the lumber trade.

Q. But in 1908 when the matter was before the Senate and when the ship owners were trying to defend what you think is a good thing now—the liberty of contracting with the shipper—and meetings went on lasting for weeks, the shipper were fully aware of it?—A. So far as my knowledge goes, it was not known in the Maritime Provinces, but we are behind there as to what is going on in this country.

Q. I should not have thought it, but at all events, if I understand you rightly, you would prefer to have no Bill at all?—A. I have no objection to the Canada Carrier's Act at all excepting for this Clause 10. My impression is that a small shipper—where a general cargo carrying ship is put on the berth and where she is ready to put in any bill of lading she likes—ought to be protected. But it is quite a different business for me to go and make a contract with the ship owner who is as capable of taking care of myself, and he makes a bargain with me, and I do not think the government can justly or fairly interfere with that bargain. That is what we are asking.

Q. Did you know as a matter of fact that under the Water Carriage of Goods Act a ship owner is at liberty to make a contract with you?—A. To tell you the truth, I don't know that such is the case.

Q. I understand you to say that before this Act went into force, which was in September, 1910, you were satisfied with the way things were working?—A. Yes, we had no complaints. I never heard of a complaint in my life in all the 44 years that I was in trade against the Conclusive Evidence clause.

Q. Are you aware that for four years before September, 1910, none of the large steamers that went to St. John ever accepted the shipper's measurement?—A. I am aware of exactly what I have explained to you. I am aware that the large shippers have chartered me their steamer with the distinct understanding that it was not a liner's bill of lading that was to be accepted, and we would not have taken her under any other circumstances; and nearly every one of the other lines have done the same thing. Now the *Indrani* that I spoke of just now belongs to the Donaldson line, and she is chartered under the old form of bill of lading, not the liner's bill of lading. She has to sign the old bill of lading and not the liner's bill of lading, and the liners themselves have merely accepted small quantities of deals as filling up stuff, and it has been furnished by the shippers in St. John for the reason that they accepted a very low freight.

Q. I just want to make that clear, because I hope we will be allowed to introduce some evidence along this line, but would you be surprised to know that the large lines, such as the Canadian Pacific railway and the Allen line, and the other large lines that went to St. John, for four years before the present Act went into force, refused to give any bill of lading that accepted the measurements of the shipper, so far as lumber is concerned?—A. Do I understand that all our large lines refused to give such a bill.

Q. As one that I know more about especially than the others, take the Canadian Pacific railway?—A. Well, the Canadian Pacific railway have never loaded a cargo of deals, they have only loaded a very small portion of their cargo in deals.

Q. I am asking you whether for such portion as they took they gave such a bill?—A. I admit that I have during the last four years furnished the Canadian Pacific railway with more lumber than anybody else.

APPENDIX No. 4

Q. Did you ever get your measurement accepted?—A. My measurement is invariably accepted, but it is accepted with the clauses in this bill of lading which to some extent obliterated the arrangement, and the Canadian Pacific railway do what the ordinary tramp steamer does not, keep a man night and day in a boat, and every precaution possible is taken not to lose a deal, and it is done on the distinct understanding that we accept their liner bill of lading.

Q. In other words when you have to do with the large liners they will not and do not accept your measurement?—A. You are entirely mistaken there.

Q. What is the difference then that you make between the position of the liners, the large boats of the Canadian Pacific railway, the Allan and the Dempsters, boats of that kind, and the other boats? What difference did you make between them during the four years before this Bill came into force?—A. No, we loaded one of the Elder Dempster boats last year, I think, and she signed a bill of lading with the conclusive evidence clause in it, because we furnished her whole cargo.

Q. Which boat was that, because we will have to look it up?—A. I do not know that I can give you the name of the boat now, but I think I could get it by telegram from St. John.

Q. Will you get us that information, please?—A. Well, the Donaldson line is the same and where she is taking cargo now, in all these boats it is with that distinct understanding. If they say, We want a thousand of deals and we take them at Pictou, Shediac or anywhere else, a full cargo of deals, it was invariably done not on the steamer's bill of lading, but a clean bill of lading, and I guarantee to furnish you bills of lading showing that if necessary.

Q. Will you do that?—A. Well, I will have to telegraph to St. John.

Q. Bills of lading from large liners where the shipper's measurement has been accepted in the bills of lading?—A. I think so.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. Pardon my asking a question at this point as I am not a member of this committee, but I think a little explanation will explain things. Counsel uses the word 'large liners,' and I think the witness in speaking of the bills of lading means a vessel, large or small, which takes an entire cargo of deals, whereas the large liners usually only take a portion of a cargo of deals in order to fill up?—A. That is the case.

Q. And the learned counsel is talking about a case where you furnish a small portion of the cargo for the Canadian Pacific railway liner, or whatever liner it might be?—A. And a very small portion of it.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. Then to clear that up where you only ship a certain portion of the cargo of one of these steamers you do not exact that?—A. We do not exact it, it is understood when we accept their offer.

Q. You do not exact that your measurement be accepted, you take the number of pieces?—A. The measurement is also put in, but it would be, I think, that under the clauses which are innumerable and unaccountable in the steamer's bill of lading she would probably not be responsible.

Q. Now, is it not a fact, do you not remember perfectly well, as in every one of these instances a clause is put in, shipper's measurement?—A. It is very possible that it is put in.

Q. Now you have had some claims put in from the other side since this Bill has been in force, haven't you?—A. I couldn't say so.

Q. I mean there must be some, you must have some complaint against the Bill; you say the thing is not workable. Now have you had to pay any claims for shortage on the other side in consequence of this Bill, since the Bill came into force in September, 1910, have you paid anything?—A. We haven't virtually made any shipments, no complete shipments, and as far as I know, except one from Halifax the other day.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Q. Then so far you have suffered nothing?—A. We have suffered nothing except we can't sell the stuff unless we give a guarantee, and we are not prepared to give the guarantee.

Q. Who has asked you to give the guarantee?—A. The Bristol Channel Importers Association and the Timber Trades Federation of the North of England have absolutely and positively said they will not accept anything else than that, they have got together and come to an understanding, and I have a cable from England, a couple of days ago bearing out my statement on that score, which if you do not object I will read.

The CHAIRMAN.—Read it, please?—A. The cable reads: 'Water Act—Bristol Channel buyers insist on guaranteeing output quantity otherwise will not buy very important repeal clause 10.'

By the Chairman:

Q. Who signs that?—A. That is a telegram from Price & Pearce, of London, one of the largest brokers in the timber trade in Great Britain. This is forwarded by H. W. Lightburne & Co., who represent John E. Moore, one of the very large shippers, and it is as follows:—

From PRICE, WALKER & CO., LTD.,
GLOUCESTER.

To MESSRS. LIGHTBURNE & CO.,
LIVERPOOL.

30th March, 1911.

DEAR SIRs,—Cargo per SS. *Hersilia* at Sheet harbour.

The provision which you suggest will not meet the requirements of the Bristol Channel importers:

We will not contract without the clause which has been adopted by our association being embodied in the contract itself.

Yours faithfully,

For PRICE, WALKER & CO., LTD.
(Sgd.) S. G. NARNEY.

Q. Who are they?—A. They are large people in the Bristol Channel, the very largest, the wealthiest at any rate.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. You are not a manufacturer, are you?—A. I am not—well I am a manufacturer but in a very small way.

Q. Your principal occupation is what?—A. I buy the deals and ship them.

Q. And you live in St. John?—A. And I live in St. John and we ship about a million and a quarter dollars worth each year.

Q. From New Brunswick and Nova Scotia?—A. Yes, we ship from every port.

Q. And you get the measurements, when you buy, from the manufacturer?—A. When I buy from the manufacturer I put a surveyor on to tally the measurement carefully.

Q. So they agree with you as to the surveyor, is that it?—A. I always put on my own surveyor, if the manufacturer puts on a surveyor against mine, he is welcome to do so, but I always put on my own.

Q. Well then, I just want to get this fact out before the committee; where, for instance, do you principally buy from, what ports?—A. We buy from all ports and places. We start at Campbellton usually and we buy from there to Yarmouth, Nova Scotia and round to Grindstone island and the Bay of Fundy.

Q. These deals which you buy are probably carried by rail for a certain distance?—A. In some cases they are.

APPENDIX No. 4

Q. Almost generally speaking?—A. Not generally speaking, as a rule. What we ship from Halifax is carried by rail.

Q. A certain proportion is carried by rail?—A. Well, a considerable proportion—at least a portion. I could not say how much.

Q. A certain proportion, at all events, is carried by rail?—A. A certain proportion.

Q. They are measured before they are put on the cars, I take it for granted?—A. Yes.

Q. Then they are carried by railway a certain distance, if they go by railway at all?—A. Yes.

Q. Then I presume in the majority of instances they are put on lighters or scows to go into the ship?—A. In the case of Halifax, Nova Scotia, they are usually put alongside the steamer.

Q. They put the cars alongside in St. John?—A. In St. John, New Brunswick the cars of deals are usually put alongside the vessels, the steamers.

Q. In numerous instances is it not the case that these deals are put on scows and lighters, and from the scows and lighters are put into the ship?—A. Some of course, but we frequently bring down deals on the cars and take the deals off the car.

Q. Isn't it a fact though—I am only speaking about your own particular way of doing business—that on the St. Lawrence, the lower St. Lawrence especially—because this Act applies to the St. Lawrence as well as to the lower provinces—a great deal of this wood which is shipped to the vessel goes out on lighters before it is put into the ship?—A. I do not know a circumstance about it because I do not ship from the St. Lawrence.

Q. But you know pretty well?—A. I know New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but I know nothing about the St. Lawrence.

Q. Is it true that a considerable part of the wood shipped to the other side is carried, after it is measured for you, on trains or put into lighters before it gets into the ship—a good portion of it?—A. You mean to say that as Mr. Crosby suggested in the ordinary course at Halifax—

Q. I did not hear Mr. Crosby's suggestion.—A. Excuse me a moment, I will just explain it to you. I will go on and make you understand it if you can understand anything.

Q. I am trying to get you to explain.—A. It is customary in Halifax and Halifax alone to load deals on the cars and send them to the vessel—

Q. You have said that already, I understand that.—A. Very well, and then in some cases they have tallied on the cars and the deals were sent to the ship with an understanding, say with Furniss or some of these people that they will accept the tally on the cars. Now in no other port is that done. In all the other ports the stuff is carried alongside the ship, excepting in the port of St. John, and in the port of St. John it is tallied at the mills with the consent of the brokers, if they wish to and agree that they will sign the bill of lading. If not, and they put on a surveyor, it is loaded and tallied alongside the vessel. But the custom of the trade—the usual custom of the trade—which is adopted in all the ports with this exception, is that the stuff is tallied alongside the ship.

Q. What you mean by tallied is measured?—A. When I say tallied it is—

Q. Wait a minute, sir, I will ask you the question.—A. According to the rule of the trade, every deal has got its size marked on it.

Q. Yes?—A. And these deals are all laid up with the size mark on them and when they are loaded, either on the cars or in the lighters, or whatever they are brought in, it is the invariable custom for them to have that mark turned up. Immediately the surveyor sees it he marks it down and the mark is there for him to read.

Q. Just to get back to where we started, because I regret we have to get back to it: in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia a great deal of the wood that is shipped to Great Britain is carried in trains or goes into lighters before it goes into the ship, isn't

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

it the case that a good deal of it goes one way or the other?—A. I will give you an illustration. At Pugwash a large proportion of deals that are shipped from there go by train to Pugwash and at Pugwash they are tallied alongside of the steamer as they are putting them into the slings. Now that is just at one point.

Q. I don't know anything about Pugwash?—A. I will give you each of them because I will not answer a question which is sweeping and which is not true, or does not convey a true impression. At Grindstone island where they load five or six vessels, it is the usual custom to send them alongside in lighters and they are there tallied alongside the ship. At Baie Verte they are sent alongside in lighters, and tallied alongside the ship. At Buctouche they are tallied alongside the ship. At Pictou they are sent by rail and tallied alongside the ship.

Q. Who are they tallied for when they get alongside the ship?—A. I mean if I buy them or any of the other shippers buy them. Where I buy them they are tallied for me.

Q. For you?—A. They are bought in small quantities from a man that has 100,000 or 500,000, and he loads them on the railway car and he sends them to Pugwash when he is ordered, and when they arrive at Pugwash the surveyor goes on and takes account of the quantity received.

Q. Now what you want, as I understand, is to have the shipowner responsible for every foot of timber that goes on to his ship; isn't that it?—A. We want the shipowner responsible for every foot we put alongside of it.

Q. And you are not satisfied with getting a guarantee that they will land the pieces that you give him, you want the measurement besides?—A. As a matter of fact I know they won't do it because they won't take them out of the port.

Q. At all events you want to get practically a guarantee that the number of pieces that go on board the ship will be delivered at the other end?—A. Exactly, and if they don't deliver them—

Q. How long do you think it would take a steamship—apart from counting the pieces—to take the measurements from your lighters or your scows alongside the ship, how long do you think the ship would be delayed?—A. She would not be delayed a minute.

Q. She would not?—A. The Canadian Pacific Railway liners and other liners invariably will tally the deals alongside of them; put on a man and give it to them as fast as they require it in the majority of cases.

Q. I don't suppose you mean a minute?—A. It will not delay her a minute. You could put on a surveyor and give him an assistant if you want to work that fast. Under the ordinary arrangement, working one sling and working it solely, why they will take the amount as fast as the ship requires them, and if you want dispatch, this man will have to be swift and go and call out the sizes of the pieces, and the surveyor merely takes his book and notes it down.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would you expect to put the rule to each piece?—A. Certainly not.

Q. That is where the point comes in. Now suppose the piece is marked fifteen feet and it is not fifteen feet?—A. That is covered under the ordinary charter party, I will show you if you will give me one of them. The quantity has to be taken at the intake measurement at the port of lading but—

Q. You can easily count the pieces?—A. No, but here it is: the brokers are not very innocent fellows and the steamship people are not very innocent fellows, and they protect themselves against claims for anything of that sort, and it is here (reads):—

Freight payable on measurement of quantity delivered as ascertained at the port of discharge.

Q. What are you quoting from, the bill of lading?—A. No, I am speaking of the charter party.

APPENDIX No. 4

Q. It is the bill of lading we are discussing.—A. Well, the bill of lading gives the charter party with all other conditions and exceptions; whatever you have got in the charter party is in the bill of lading.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. Then the bill of lading over-rides the charter party?—A. It cannot over-ride the charter party.

Q. That is what you are here trying to get fixed?—A. No, I tell you what—

Mr. CROSBY.—Then, Mr. Chairman, all I have got to say is that my friend Mr. McKean is wasting his time, because if this law does not call for a bill of lading with certain conditions, then you can make a charter party just as you please; but the Act distinctly states, no matter what may be contained in the charter party or any agreement, that the ship shall not be held responsible except for the pieces that are tallied on board. If that is not the case you are wasting your time?—A. Wait a moment, I was dealing with what the chairman has spoken about. Supposing a piece of deal is marked 15, 9, 3, and it is, as a matter of fact only 15 ft. x 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ -in. x 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ -in, the ship would be entitled to claim for 15 x 9 x 3, but she would not be responsible because the deal is thin.

Q. How would she ascertain that?—A. She is not required to do so, because by her charter party she is entitled to be paid for it on the intake.

By the Chairman:

Q. But she caught at the port of delivery, not of intake, if it is correctly marked, it is all right?—A. It is invariably correctly marked, it might be a little thin, or a little thick.

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. Supposing when you go to the other side with the deals and you find that there was a mistake in the measurement marked on that deal would the shipowner be responsible for that mistake?—A. He would not.

Q. He would not?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Why wouldn't they?—A. I am taking it now supposing the deal were incorrectly marked in this way, supposing it is $\frac{1}{8}$ of an inch thin, supposing it was only 2 $\frac{7}{8}$ when it was marked 3 inches the ship would not be responsible on the other side under the terms of the charter party.

Q. But the man to whom delivery was made would call upon the ship for the delivery according to the bill of lading?—A. It is not often done, in my experience of 44 years where deals have turned out thin the ship has not been held responsible.

Q. Or where they are turned out short?—A. They are very seldom turned out short.

Q. But they might be?—A. Well the ship would be entitled to a re-survey, to have the timber measured and see whether it is short or not. But it has never in my experience turned out that way.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. Supposing when the cargo gets to the other side the deals turned out to be thin?—A. Yes.

Q. Has the consignee any recourse and what?—A. The rule of the trade, and the custom, is that he puts a claim for the deals that are thin, he makes a claim upon the shipper of the cargo that the deals are thin.

Q. It comes back to the shipper does it?—A. Yes, it does, and it is settled by arbitration.

Q. How is that?—A. There is a clause in your contract by which such cases are settled by arbitration, if there is any cause of complaint as to the deals being narrow or thin, it invariably comes back to the shipper.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Q. He demands a re-survey?—A. It is left to the arbitration of three men, and it is left to them what will be allowed. I can show you the provision in the contract.

Q. The ship has never to pay a loss of that character?—A. The ship is never called upon to pay a loss of that character and I know it from years of experience.

Witness discharged.

Mr. HUGH MCKAY, St. John, N.B., called and sworn.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. You are with W. M. McKay & Company, lumber shippers?—A. Yes.

Q. What quantity of lumber does your firm ship in the course of the year?—A. Last year we shipped 125,000,000, this year we will ship about the same quantity, but take the average for twenty years we have shipped over 200,000,000 feet per year.

Q. What effect does this Water Carriage of Goods Act, section 10, have upon your business?—A. The question was asked a while ago what effect it has had on the shipments that have been made. We shipped a couple of cargoes last fall on which there was some loss, in one case part of the cargo was lost alongside, and in the other the vessel lost a part of the deck load on the way over; in each case the loss was not ours, so we never heard anything more about it. With regard to the effect of the Act upon our business in selling the stuff, as it has been explained before, we cannot sell unless we give a guarantee that delivery will be made on the other side according to the quantities shipped as shown by the statement of the sworn surveyor on this side.

Q. You heard Mr. McKean's evidence as to the additional expenses which will be incurred, what is your view on that subject?—A. I could not express any opinion because my experience on the other side is not sufficient to enable me to say what it would cost for a re-survey over there. Mr. McKean is in a position to say better than anybody else what it will be.

By the Chairman:

Q. Excuse me a moment, I want to understand that. What Mr. McKean refers to as a re-survey on the other side is an actual measurement of the lumber by rule, is it not?—A. I presume so.

Q. It would not be a tally, counting the figures on the planks?—A. No, they measure the stuff. When the lumber is imported there the importer takes it from the ship to his yard where it is piled in all sorts of forms as quickly as possible and measured afterward.

Q. And Mr. McKean's measurement is not an actual measurement, but simply a record of the measurement already made and marked upon the timber; I am speaking of the measurements on this side?—A. I couldn't say.

Q. Can you take a rule and measure every plank as it goes on the vessel for five cents a thousand?—A. No, it would be impossible to get the steamer to load under those conditions.

Q. That is not workable at all?—A. Oh no.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. What action has been taken by the purchasers of lumber on the other side in consequence of the adoption of this Water Carriage of Goods Act?—A. They have refused, as I said a minute or two ago, to buy unless they are given a guarantee that they will get the quantity that our specifications call for.

Q. You cannot sell any goods at all without that guarantee on the other side?—A. No, we have sold half a dozen cargoes under those conditions already, somebody has to take the stuff, we can't pile it up on this side, it has to go over there so we have to sell it the best way we can.

APPENDIX No. 4

Q. Do you know the names of the firms that have insisted upon these guarantees?
—A. We have sold a cargo to Malcolm & Dickson, of Cardiff & London, and have sold to the Jones firm in the Bristol Channel. All the firms that buy deals regularly make the demand.

Q. The practice has always been in the past, until this Act was passed, to have the conclusive evidence clause in the bill of lading, has it?—A. Always.

Q. And except where the large liners have taken a small portion of their cargo in order to make up their full cargo?—A. There is never a charter party for the liner, it is only a liner bill of lading in that case.

Q. Did you ever ship any goods without having the conclusive evidence clause in the bill of lading until this Act came into force?—A. We never did.

Q. Was this guarantee ever asked for before the passage of this Act?—A. Never to my knowledge in five or six years experience.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. Do you think it will be practicable to measure the wood on scows alongside of the ship, for instance before it went into the ship, to get it the exact quantity?—A. That wood do you mean.

Q. Yes.—A. It would be practicable but you could not possibly get a steamer to load under those conditions; it would be too slow, it would take a year to load a cargo.

By Mr. Loggie:

Q. But, Mr. Mackay, there is no liability except as to marks. That is to say if the tally is marked 15, 9 x 3—?—A. I may say in regard to those marks that our surveyors are all experienced men. Most of them have worked in mills before they started in to get their license as surveyors, and if there is a deal marked 15, when it is only 14 feet, those men will soon spot it. Our men have instructions that everything is to be full width and if it is not full width it comes back on us. A man of experience will not take a 2½-in. deal for a 3-in., it is soon spotted and our surveyor marks it down.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. Measurements would have to be done in the daytime?—A. Yes.

Q. And the days are very short in the autumn and the ship would be detained a tremendous time in making these measurements?—A. Yes, that is right.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. McKean spoke of the large loss of the shippers, referring to shortage?—A. The cost on the other side.

Q. According to him the loss to New Brunswick is a very large amount of money?—A. If we have to follow it out on the other side.

Q. Is the shortage a large item?—A. Well, as far as we are concerned, we would never hear of the shortage at all. Last summer I think there were just two vessels we heard of. One was the *Pontiac* and the other the *Carisbrooke*. In the case of the *Pontiac*, Mr. Knight, our broker at St. John, checked the quantity twice and could not find anything wrong. I believe, however, the ship had to pay a small sum of forty or fifty pounds. The *Pontiac* came in for this loss owing to odd pieces being dropped off in loading. Another thing: half of the deals landed from the Maritime Provinces are landed in foreign bottoms.

Q. Anything that dropped off in course of loading would be a claim against the insurance company?—A. It has been.

Q. The captain does not notice anything dropping off but it comes short on the other side and he cannot make a claim?—A. That is the captain's fault, not the shipper's. The surveyor is the servant of the ship, not of the shipper.

Q. He is nominally the servant of the shipper?—A. He is the servant of the ship, the ship employs him.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

been done on the other side. Our methods are more accurate on this side. All that we as shippers ask is that that vessel will give us such a document as will hold them absolutely liable for not only the number of pieces, but such a document as will hold them responsible for the measurement of those pieces according to the marks on the deals at the time they received them on the vessel. That can be determined more easily at the port of loading than at the port of discharge, for the reason I have already mentioned in reference to Manchester.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. Where does the point arise where you discharge the ship from any liability?—A. The ship at Manchester has to wait, as far as settlement is concerned, until those deals are tallied on that side. Settlements in Manchester are very slow, and as a consequence sometimes the vessel will have to wait for six months before a settlement is arrived at, and we as shippers are affected adversely in the same way.

Q. Do you want the owners of the ships to be responsible for all the damages of loss on that side that you have spoken of?—A. The owners of the ships have their agents on that side who can look after that, and why should we as Canadian shippers be required to follow those goods across and be held responsible for the difficulties which may arise on that side when the ship should give us some sort of absolute receipt for what we give them.

Q. That is not my difficulty. If the ship can immediately deliver that on the other side and be then relieved of responsibility it would be different, but you want to hold her for six months?—A. I admit that as far as Manchester is concerned there is that difficulty which both the shippers and the shipowners are up against. Now take the Bristol Channel trade, a buyer buys a cargo for there and takes it up to Gloucester or Sharpness. There delivery is not done as rapidly as in Manchester. There is a clause in the charter party which says in connection with that trade that delivery shall not exceed 120 standards a day, and in that case a vessel is able absolutely to tally every deal as it goes over the side in order to see that it is landed in proper condition on the wharf.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. If the vessel wanted to take the precaution to tally at Manchester could it not do so?—A. What vessels are after is despatch, that is the desire of the owners, they want to get away from there as quickly as possible. If they wanted to they could hold the vessel there and discharge the cargo at the rate of 120 standards a day and tally accurately. We load at Miramichi and while the custom at the port is to load only 80 or 90 standards a day we have loaded up to 200 standards a day and tallied every one of those deals because we put on enough men to do it, so that it is possible to do that. The way we do it is we send our men there, one man stands at each end of the sling, there will be two slings working on the barges, and the marks are taken down as the pieces are sent aboard.

Mr. CROSBY.—You only tally the marks?—A. You may think there will be a little complication there between firsts, seconds and thirds; in the spruce trade we class firsts, seconds and thirds as reputable spruce, and they are accepted that way when coming from reputable dealers. A man who is accustomed to that kind of work will astonish you with the speed at which he can record those marks and record them accurately. So that the difficulty I have found on the other side was this, and I have sold a considerable number of cargoes over there, that I have had to give a guarantee to those parties that we would be responsible for any shortage that occurred on that side, should such shortage take place under this clause, and it has. I have not a copy of the letter here which came from the other side, but I think the document they sent to us was to this effect: 'That until clause 10 of the Canadian Water Carriage of Goods Act of 1910 was repealed, they asked us to take the responsibility for any shortage should such shortage occur in a quantity, and to that I had to accede, otherwise I would have been

APPENDIX No. 4

unable to make sales. Now as far as the banks are concerned, bankers have told me that the bill of lading is not conclusive evidence of the quantity and is not a negotiable document. As far as we are personally concerned that does not enter into it as we do like Mr. McKay does—send the bills of lading forward—we don't ask the banks to take the bills of lading. But it is putting an injustice on the smaller men who may be forced to ship. Instead of selling to Mr. McKay and some of the larger men these men may be compelled to ship their lumber, and if they do, not having the same status in the bank as the larger men, they would be unable to take that bill of lading in, hand it over and get their money for it because the bank would at once say: 'There is a responsibility resting on you in reference to that cargo on the outside as to measurements and pieces, and if any shortage occurs, although we do not know what it will be, there will be a call back on you for the amount.'

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. That would be the case in any shipment, would it not?—A. That would not be the case in any shipment under the old bill of lading, because it was conclusive evidence.

Q. When you ship to firms in Liverpool, have they objected to the form under clause 10?—A. They have objected. Some of our customers have objected and they have asked me—Messrs. Price, Walker & Company are one of the firms we have sold to largely, and they have impressed upon me the importance of trying to get this form changed. And Messrs. Farnworth & Jardine, our selling agents, and one of the members of that firm is here to-day, have told us that some change must be made, we must get that objectionable clause obliterated as their solicitors on the other side claim their bill of lading is not any good under the present Water Carriage of Goods Act.

Q. And you had difficulty in selling?—A. We had difficulty. I was there ten days before I sold a stick and then I had to give a guarantee.

By the Chairman:

Q. People naturally want to get what you sell them?—A. We, as reputable Canadian shippers, wish to do business on reputable lines, but we do not want to be in a position where we are not protected by the parties who give us a receipt for what we give any more than when we go into a bank and the bank says: "We cannot give you a receipt for this amount of money. We presume it is all right but there may be a bad bill in it." We want an absolute receipt for our goods the same as for our money, because this is the only money we have got.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. Take the ordinary everyday shipper. Do you think it is fair for him to go down to a ship and say. 'Here I have so many hundred, or so many thousand pieces of board. Your ship contains so many thousand feet of lumber. I want a clean bill of lading for that.'—A. Yes.

Q. The Captain says: 'I have no way of ascertaining whether that contains the quantity of lumber or not.' You know if you give a signed bill of lading for that lumber he must furnish that contents when he gets to the other side; if the lumber is tallied and found to be a hundred thousand short the ship has got to pay for it. If this condition is hard can you suggest some way, some manner whereby we can probably make this clause 10 suit the circumstances more particularly of the shipper without putting the onus, as we had it before, on the ship.—A. What does the bank do? What does the Bank of Montreal do when you go in with a deposit? They don't take your account for it, they put on a man we call a teller.

Q. Very true.—A. Why should not the ship do the same thing?

Q. There is a difference in taking money into the Bank of Montreal and putting deals into a ship. Any man can tell you, when you have got a bundle of notes, what is there.—A. Can any man tell? They do not put a man there who has no experience,

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

they do not put Tom, Dick and Harry into the teller's box, they get an experienced man for it.

Q. My question is this: Take the mate of a steamer, or some man of that kind, if he knew as much about lumber as Mr. Snowball he might be in a lumber office?—A. Exactly, as I have said many times.

Q. But he is on that ship as an officer and has to tally that lumber. All he can take is the marks. But suppose a marked cargo is put on board ship without taking count of the marks at all and he takes the shipper's certificate and signs the bill of lading. You know that in some cases you put a cargo on board ship and you want a clean bill of lading. You say 'I want a clean bill of lading.' The Master says 'I cannot give you a clean bill of lading.' Well, you give him a letter of indemnity. That is to say, if there is any shortage in the cargo they come back to you for it.—A. The only way they have is to put a checker on.

Q. And then when they put on a checker?—A. If they put on a man and I was satisfied I would be willing to give them such a letter. I have given them such a letter when the Captain would come in and say: 'You have put a lot of deals on board here which I do not think are merchantable deals.' You are not shipping merchantable deals but you have a certain amount of fourths in her; for instance, in shipping pine. Well, I give them a letter at once, indemnifying them at once as far as equity is concerned. The Captain says 'I want a letter to indemnify me for this cargo.' I say 'That was put on by a sworn surveyor.' They are all sworn and there is no trouble in any district for the Captain to get any tallyman to tally his cargo, and he is compelled to do it in the province of New Brunswick.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. Mr. Crosby asked a very pertinent question; would the shippers be satisfied if you were to get a bill of lading by which the ship acknowledged to have received a certain number of pieces having certain marks upon them and agreed to deliver on the other side the same number of pieces containing those marks?—A. Well, you could not do that.

Q. It would be satisfactory?—A. It would be satisfactory if the bill of lading would have the whole specification on it. Not unless you attached the specification and made it a part of the bill of lading, which would be a very difficult thing. Our bills of lading of course—

Q. Well, in effect, you have the same thing at present: the ship is not liable for any difference in the marks?—A. Certainly, I have already stated that the shipper is not liable for any difference in the marks.

Q. That is to say, if they are inaccurately marked, that is a matter between the seller and the buyer.—A. Captains have come to me and said, 'Mr. Snowball, it is not fair to take your tally.' I would say, 'All right, Captain, put on men. If you don't know where to get them I will get them for you. All you have got to do is to go to the town hall and they will tell you.'

By the Chairman:

Q. You do not propose that a ship will actually measure all these pieces?—A. You mean put a rule on them?

Q. Yes.—A. He is not liable for it, Mr. Sinclair.

Q. What happens now? Suppose the ship goes across, she gets so many standards?—A. Yes.

Q. And when she gets to the other side she delivers at Sharpness or one of those ports?—A. Yes.

Q. When the vessel delivers ten standards short what happens? Does not the receiver refuse to pay the freight on these ten standards?—A. If the captain has delivered the number of pieces, none having been lost overboard, and none having

APPENDIX No. 4

been cut or no broken pieces taken in, the brokers will adjust that matter by making him an allowance, and they have done it.

Q. But if there are these standards short?—A. He will get his freight for it.

Q. How can he get his freight if they are not received?—A. But he does.

Q. But he is asked to pay the value of these ten standards he is supposed to have lost, that is deducted from his freight?—A. No, it is not, if it is shortage in the manufacturing.

Q. I do not know whether it is the case.—A. The deals are not measured out by the master in that way, he does not put the rule to them. He takes a chance on these deals and if there is any mistake——

Q. The ship does not have to pay for them?—A. Is not asked to pay for them. Suppose, for instance, a ship takes on 1,500 pieces of 7 by 3, and when it comes to the other side instead of 1,500 pieces of 7 by 3 there are 1,500 pieces of 6 by 3. It is a case where a mistake has occurred.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. The ship is liable?—A. The ship is not liable.

By the Chairman:

Q. It is liable under this?—A. But he is never held to it, the man who delivers the goods says, 'Here is an evident mistake.' You have to make laws for dealing largely with honest men; laws are not made to deal with scoundrels.

Q. I have known honest men who wouldn't want to make any law at all.—A. I know the law is made largely to protect honest men, the law is not made on the presumption that every one would be a scoundrel.

Q. I agree with you but the point I want to make is that when a steamer delivers a cargo and there is a shortage on the bill of lading the ship is held responsible on it?—A. He is responsible if he has signed, but there is an intimate connection between the buyer and the seller, and this man comes in and says there is an evident mistake, you look it up and the man does so and he sees that it is evidently a mistake, that there has been some $7 \times 2\frac{1}{2}$ instead of 3 shipped, and the matter is settled at once.

Q. How many times has that occurred?—A. I do not know that it has occurred very often to us, but I do know it has occurred where there have been mixed shipments.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. Is it not a fact that no captain should sign a bill of lading except for what he is positively and absolutely sure he has received, isn't that right?—A. That is right.

Q. He cannot be positively and absolutely sure unless he measures it?—A. Can he be then?

Q. And you say that is impracticable?—A. He may not be able to offhand——

Q. Mr. McKay says that is not practicable.—A. I know that question was put to him, he is a young man, but I would have answered in this way, that it is not possible for any vessel to do that, to put a rule on every one of those pieces, it is not the way that the business is done.

Q. You know there is a peculiarity that when a man is receiving goods on board a ship he is making a contract with a man who is no party to the contract in the first instance?—A. Well, not in all cases.

Q. In almost all cases?—A. For instance I charter many vessels myself, but as soon as my cargo is on board my liability ceases.

Q. There is an implied contract to deliver the goods to the consignee who is no party to the contract in the first place?—A. Is that so, as it works out?

Q. That is the common law?—A. But when the contract is assigned to him it becomes vested in him the moment it is altered, and the charter party is assigned.

Q. There is where the captain should be more careful because he is doing busi-

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

ness with a party whom he does not know at all?—A. It should be taken for granted, I think, that the cargo having been checked by a duly qualified surveyor—

Q. You can't take anything for granted.—A. Then let the captain put on another surveyor. Because it costs him 5 cents a thousand to do this why should all this inconvenience be caused to us? They are nearly all foreign vessels that are engaged in this trade, the *Pontiac* and the *Micmac* used to be engaged in the trade, but the *Pontiac* was lost and the *Micmac* is looking around for charters, that is the only Canadian vessel that I know of that is engaged in the trade, there may be a few of the Battle line left but I haven't heard of them this year. So that the shippers have to put themselves largely in the hands of foreign captains, largely Norwegian and German, there are very few British captains engaged in the trade, and we have to have something to protect ourselves against any defect or inefficiency in these parties who are looking after their own interests rather than our interests.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. Is there any way of relieving the shipper and not placing too big a responsibility on the ship? There is no reason why the ship should be held responsible as she was under the old Act. Can you, as a man of experience and knowledge of the interests of the trade, suggest some change and amendment which will remove the difficulty so far as the shipper is concerned, and not hamper the shipowner too much. If that could be done it would help out a great deal.—A. To my mind the only equitable way to do that is to insist on the steamer supplying a sworn surveyor to tally that cargo on board and require the shipowner to accept that sworn surveyor's return of the cargo.

By Mr. McKenzie:

Q. And you are willing to pay that much added freight, I suppose?—A. We are paying 5 cents a thousand which does not affect us very much. I am willing to pay the captain the bill for surveying the cargo as long as he will do it. Five cents a thousand is a mere bagatelle, but what we want to do is to put something in the Act that will put us in an absolutely safe position as against the captain who might be disposed to benefit by certain things, that there may be inducements to him to benefit by, or by carelessness in the transaction of his business and against the receiver on the other side who might accidentally make a mistake in the tallying of the cargo on the wharf. I know of an instance which was related to me yesterday of a cargo which on receipt on the other side turned out short. The shippers felt perfectly satisfied there was no shortage, and an investigation was held, the result being that they found a portion of the cargo in another man's yard; the delivery there, this was delivered in London, is by the Dock Company, and by a mistake a part of the cargo had been delivered to the wrong man. It was rectified at once and the ship broker who started the investigation was notified. Now if the captain had been watching his cargo he would have been careful to see that it went on the right dock.

By Mr. Loggie:

Q. One of the difficulties seems to be that primarily that loss falls upon the ship. Supposing when the cargo reaches Liverpool it is found to be five standards short and it is found that the shortage is caused by a mistake, an error in the work of tallying. Primarily, in the first place, the ship pays that loss, but it is eventually repaid to the ship by the shipper?—A. Well you want to know who would pay that loss if the mistake was made by the shipper himself?

Q. Yes?—A. I think the shipper should pay it.

Q. Yes. But does the ship pay it primarily when it arrives and makes delivery on the other side? It is kept off the freight?—A. It largely depends upon whether it is a self-evident error. If it is they come back and adjust it, and if they cannot show that it is an error of the shipper, an error of calculation or an error in returning a wrong count, there is no reputable shipper that I know of, no shipper in New

APPENDIX No. 4

Brunswick who ships deals to-day who would not stand behind an apparent error on his part and make it right.

Q. Yes, but unless it is an apparent error the loss in the meantime is upon the vessels?—A. We have shipped 20 to 30 million and the only claim from the ship-owners that carried our deals that we have had have been for a very small amount, and that mostly for deals broken going in. We shipped one vessel last year in September and the consignee notified us that we had to indemnify them against all loss. Our agents bluffed them and wouldn't do it but eventually said: 'Oh well, let us hear from you if anything occurs.' The cargo contained 1,600 standards and it was delivered on the other side and there was no claim from anybody.

By the Chairman:

Q. How much was the shortage?—A. There was no shortage. I have seen the shipper since and asked him about it and there was no claim. If you will allow me for one moment I may say that I have received the following telegrams (reads):

NELSON, N.B., April 26, 1911.

W. B. SNOWBALL, Esq.,
Russel House,
Ottawa.

'Regret circumstances prevent a large delegation from Miramichi in re Water Carriage Goods Act, but we wish you to inform committee we are fully in accord with the view of delegation and strongly urge the repeal of section 10. Already the injurious effect of this section is being felt by the shipping trade and if not repealed must have serious results. We wish you every success in your mission.'

(Sgd.) GEO. BURCHILL AND SONS.
TIMOTHY LYNCH LUMBER CO.
JOHN O'BRIEN.
A. AND R. LOGGIE.
FRANK HARRISON CO.
F. E. NEALE.
MIRAMICHI LUMBER CO.
JOHN T. RUNDLE.

CAMPBELLTON, N. B., April 25, 1911.

W. B. SNOWBALL,
Russell House,
Ottawa.

'Please represent us at conference with Minister of Marine and Fisheries over changes requested in Canadian Water Carriage of Goods Act, which we trust will be granted.'

(Sgd.) SHIVES LUMBER CO.
RICHARDS MANUFACTURING CO.

BOSTON, MASS., April 25, 1911.

JOHN F. MOORE & Co.,
St. John, N. B.

'This empowers you to represent us fully as though present ourselves at Ottawa in protest of and for repeal of Water Carriage Act, representing at our various mills the product of over fifty million logs. The Act is absolutely destructive of Transatlantic Lumber business.'

(Sgd.) STETSON, CUTLER & CO.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Now the output of these firms are as follows: George Burchill and Sons, 8 millions; Timothy Lynch Lumber Co., 8 millions; John O'Brien, 38 millions; A. and R. Loggie, 3 millions; Frank Harrison Co., 65 millions; F. E. Neale, Miramich Lumber Co., 16 millions; the Shives Lumber Co., 25 millions, and Richards Manufacturing Co., 15 millions. I want to make an explanation in reference to these gentlemen from Miramichi that have signed: not one of these gentlemen have been able to sell one deal this year so far, largely on account of this Act. If they buy they will buy at very much reduced rates, but so far they have not been able to sell one deal yet.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. When did you give your first guarantee?—A. This winter.

Q. That was the first time you have shipped since the passage of the Act, was it?—A. We have not shipped anything yet.

Q. Not since the Act came into force?—A. We shipped once in September, they asked me for a guarante. It was on the new form of charter, and as I say, we placed it.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. How did it turn out?—A. It turned out all right. We had no claim, but we might have had.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. You did not have, as a matter of fact?—A. We did not have a claim, but that shows how careful we shippers of deals are, and the other New Brunswick shippers are as careful as we are.

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you aware of any claims made since the Act came into force, since September last?—A. No, I am not aware of any for the season has not opened yet. We don't commence shipping until the month of May.

Witness discharged.

Mr. R. RITCHIE, Newcastle, N.B., called and sworn.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. You are in business as a manufacturer of lumber?—A. Yes.

Q. How long have you been in business?—A. Six years, I think.

Q. And what is your output?—A. Eh, from about 12 to 15 millions a year.

Q. Where do you ship from?—A. Newcastle.

Q. On the Miramichi?—A. Yes.

Q. What effect has this Act as to the custody of the lumber from the time it is loaded on the ship until it is delivered on the other side?—A. It has a very serious effect. Of course, we have got to give a guarantee, as Mr. Snowball and the other gentlemen have said, for the delivery of the lumber on the other side.

Q. You object to clause 10 of the Act?—A. Oh, certainly.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. You are a manufacturer?—A. Yes, manufacturer and shipper. We manufacture our own stuff and ship it.

Q. How far are your mills from the port?—A. Newcastle is thirty miles from the mouth of the harbour.

Q. Then you load by lighter?—A. No, we load right from the wharf.

APPENDIX No. 4

By the Chairman:

Q. There would not be much chance of loss in your case?—A. Not in our case because we really only ship our own cut and our own stock.

Q. Have you had any trouble about claims?—A. Not any trouble.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. You have not shipped any lumber since the new Act went into force?—A. Not since the new Act.

By the Chairman:

Q. Prior to that had you any trouble about claims?—A. There might be trifling shortage. In all cases we checked our tally books and any errors against us we rectified.

Q. And the guarantee they ask for is a guarantee that the actual superficial feet will be delivered on the other side?—A. Yes, that is what they ask for.

Q. That has been asked for recently, hasn't it?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Loggie:

Q. Do you consider conclusive evidence in the charter party an important thing in regard to the lumber business?—A. Oh, yes, we must have it, we should have it. Of course, the owners of any ship or steamer have the right to put a sworn surveyor on, and we have actually asked them to do it in lots of cases. And there is no reason why they cannot get the corrected account. The deals are all properly marked, length and breadth, and there is no reason why they cannot get a proper estimate of the quantity. We don't see any trouble. There may be cases, just as some of the other gentlemen here have mentioned, about deals being wrongly marked; that is a very exceptional case. There may be a deal a foot too long, and the next deal may be a foot too short. It would not be one half per cent in the quantity shipped, it would be only nominal.

Witness discharged.

Committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Room 32,

Thursday, May 4, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Sinclair, presiding, and proceeded to the further consideration of Clause 10 of the Water Carriage of Goods Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The business this morning, gentlemen, is the further consideration of Clause 10 of the Water Carriage of Goods Act. I do not know if there are any more witnesses to be examined.

Mr. TAYLOR (St. John). I have no more witnesses.

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—I would like to file, through Mr. Robb, manager of the Shipping Federation, certain charter parties, which have to do with the shipment of wood, on the backs of which are the bills of lading. These charter parties, I learn from the manager of the federation, are still in force, and they are charter parties

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

and bills of lading, dealing with shipments of wood, which I understand are agreed upon between the Chambers of Shipping in places in Russia and the Timber Trade Federation in the United Kingdom. One of these charter parties with the bill of lading attached covers Crondstadt, Riga, and Memel. That is for shipments to Great Britain of these classes of goods, wood goods. I see in this charter party which I will file through Mr. Robb, a clause numbered 6. which reads as follows:

"The bills of lading to be prepared on the form endorsed on this charter, and shall be signed by the master, quality, condition and measure unknown, freight and all conditions clauses, and exceptions as per this charter. The owners shall be responsible for the number of pieces signed for by the master or his duly authorized agent, fire and fraud excepted. Perils of the seas and rivers, when the cargo is in lighters also excepted.

Mr. DANIEL.—When you speak of owners do you mean owners of cargo or ship owners?

Mr. MEREDITH.—I should say the owners of the ship. Then if you take the bill of lading, it says—'Pieces on deck at charterer's risk.' And then at the bottom: 'Quality, condition and measure unknown.' Now I might ask Mr. Robb some questions just to save time.

The CHAIRMAN.—We had better have Mr. Robb examined.

Mr. ROBB, Montreal, called and sworn.

By Mr. Meredith:

Q. You are the manager and secretary of the Shipping Federation of Canada?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you look at these charter parties and bills of lading and state whether they are the documents that they purport to be? You might explain what they are.

A. The first charter party that we have before us now is that of the Chamber of Shipping. The chamber consists of the Shipowners' Associations of the United Kingdom, it is practically a shipowner's parliament and the charter party is arranged by the Chamber of Shipping with the Timber Trade Federation of the United Kingdom, that is a federation of all the different timber merchants of the United Kingdom. The first charter party is one used in Cronstadt, Riga and Memel to the United Kingdom. The second is a Chamber of Shipping Wood Charter (Scandinavian and Finland) to the United Kingdom. It originated in 1899. These are all known and public documents and they are recognized by one code word so that if merchants wish to charter a vessel all they have got to do is to use this one code word which signifies this charter party.

Q. So the second charter party you have referred to is—A. Scandinavian and Finland. It is endorsed 'Arranged with the Timber Trade Federation of the United Kingdom.' The next one is the Chamber of Shipping Pitch Pine Charter, 1906, for the United Kingdom, European Continent and Mediterranean. This is also endorsed Arranged with the Timber Trade Federation of the United Kingdom.

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. Has it the same clause as the others?—A. The same clause as the others. Then there is the Baltic Charter party. That is for shipping railway sleepers. These are the principal places in competition with Canadian wood goods.

Q. They all hold that clause as to quantity and quality?—A. Yes, on the back.

By the Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Is there any such agreement meant at all in regard to Canada?—A. No, there is no agreement.

APPENDIX No. 4

Q. Or with the United States?—A. Not with the United States.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. Was there not an agreement made with Canada?—A. I believe there is an agreement with Canadian lumbermen and some individual shippers, but not with the largest firms shipping.

Q. But there has been a standard charter party adopted for the Canadian Wood Goods Trade?—A. I will put in one of the forms if you like.

Q. I mean before the enactment of the Water Carriage of Goods Act, there was a standard form?—A. Yes, there was a general one.

Q. And that standard form called for the Conclusive Evidence Clause in the Bill of Lading?—A. Well, I could not say, but I have not got that form.

Q. But you know as a matter of fact that it did?—A. I could not say for St. John.

Q. I am not talking about St. John, but the general shipment of Wood Goods from Canada to the United Kingdom?—A. Are you speaking about the Charter Party, here (reads):—

Q. The Charter Party entirely?—A. I think I have a Canadian Charter Party here (reads):—

“The Bill of Lading shall be conclusive evidence against the Owners of the quantity of cargo shipped on board as stated therein.”

That is the one you refer to?

Q. Exactly?—A. But in the Bill of Lading which is used there is a clause that the shipowner is not responsible for the measurement.

Q. Is there an agreement with reference to shippers from Cronstandt, Riga, and Memel to places other than the United Kingdom? Does that agreement apply to Australia, South America and South Africa?—A. From the Baltic to Australia do you mean?

Q. Yes?—A. Very few cargoes go from the Baltic to Australia.

Q. Do you know whether it applies or not?—A. No.

The CHAIRMAN.—Have they any clause similar to Clause 10 in Australia?

Mr. TAYLOR.—I do not know, I am trying to find out from Mr. Robb, and I presume they have not or he would know.

The CHAIRMAN.—We have a copy of the Australia Act.

The WITNESS.—Yes they have a Water Carriage of Goods Act, in Australia.

By the Chairman:

Q. But it does not refer to timber?—A. No.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. In the United States it does not?—A. No, it is a special class of goods, we are a timber country; they are not, they have no timber to export now. Of course there is the Georgia pine from the Southern States but that is all they have. I might submit here the charter party for the steamer *Jacona*, which is in the form used by Messrs. John E. Moore & Co., Limited, of St. John, New Brunswick, a steamer chartered on March 22 of this year. Now I will read you the clause there and this is, I believe, the form which has been in use in St. John for a number of years.

Mr. F. R. TAYLOR.—No, you are mistaken.

A. When did it come out?

Mr. TAYLOR.—Since the Water Carriage of Goods Act was passed.

A. It reads:

“Bills of lading shall be conclusive evidence against the owners as establishing the number of pieces delivered to ship as stated therein, the captains' or agents' signature to be accepted in all cases as binding on owners.”

That is one clause and this follows:

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

"On completion of loading, charterers' or their agents shall have liberty to board vessels and to crossmark the top pieces of the deck load, also to mark on uprights in painted lines the height of deck cargo. Ship shall give due notice of completion of loading and facilities for so marking."

That is the ship's charter which is in use just now, and of course there is a bill of lading which covers this.

By Mr. Daniel:

Q. That includes Clause 10, which you have just read?

Mr. CROSBY.—The only change in that charter party is that there you provide for having the deck load properly marked so that any change in the deck load would be known.

By Mr. Daniel:

Q. Who gets out that charter party or bill of lading?—A. This one is printed by the John E. Moore Company, Limited, of St. John, New Brunswick, and the ship accepts that.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. Will you look at that, (handing document to witness) that is the form of charter party that was adopted before the Water Carriage of Goods, that is an entirely new form that was adopted afterwards. You will notice that in that charter party proof of evidence as to quantity and quality is inserted, and that is the standard form which was in use before this Water Carriage of Goods Act came into force. The charter party you produce was only adopted by merchants after that Act was introduced, I happen to know that because I have something to do with the charter party?—A. But this bill of lading was made out for the number of pieces. This is the bill of lading for under deck 26,954 pieces of spruce deals, there is nothing about measurements here.

Q. Read the charter party?—A. But this is the bill of lading that you take to the bank, which is a negotiable document. The bill of lading here states the number of pieces; that is our whole argument.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C. :

Q. The number of pieces only?—A. The number of pieces only, so that the ship is not responsible for the quantity.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. Did you read the charter party here to be conclusive evidence?—A. That is the number of pieces, the freight is calculated on that, that is only for the matter of freight, the goods are carried at so much per standard.

Q. Now, Mr. Robb, read this: "20,643 pieces spruce deals containing 318 ⁵²⁶/₁₉₈₀ St. Petersburg Standards".—A. Read further down.

Q. Read the whole thing and you will find it just exactly as I said?—A. The description here is, "Under deck 11,273 pieces Spruce Deals" containing so many St. Petersburg Standards, and under that is "2,950 pieces Spruce Deals ends, containing —"so many St. Petersburg Standards and "on deck 9,370 pieces Spruce Deals containing—"so many St. Petersburg Standards.

Q. So that you were mistaken in saying that it only calls for pieces and not for quantity?

By Mr. Crosby:

Q. A vessel would be responsible for delivery of the pieces, and not the quantity, under that?—A. Undoubtedly.

APPENDIX No. 4

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—I do not know whether it is the pleasure of the Committee that these documents should be filed in toto, or whether it would be advisable to have entered in the Minutes the clauses which we refer to.

The CHAIRMAN.—They had better be filed, but the reporter should not be required to copy the whole of the charter party in the record.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—It would be advisable that the clauses which relate to the matter under discussion should be put in evidence.

Mr. MEREDITH.—I do not intend to offer any evidence except this, our contention is that the custom all over the world is that a ship should only be responsible for the pieces, not the measurement, and the statement was made, I think inadvertently, the other day that in Canada there was an exceptional position, as I understand it, that Canada was the only place where the shipowner was not responsible for measurement. As a matter of fact under the Campbell Act a shipper in Canada is in exactly the same position as people shipping from the Baltic, from Russia, the Mediterranean, or Scandinavia and these are the principle competitors of the lumbermen who ship from Canada. Now if those lumbermen who ship from Scandinavia, from Russia, from the Mediterranean, have agreed with the Timber Association of England who only hold the shipowner responsible for pieces and not for measurement, I fail to see where the shipper of timber from Canada should try to hold the steamship owner for measurement, which is an entirely different thing.

Mr. DANIEL.—You speak of timber and of lumber; I would like to know from you whether this bill of lading you speak of from Scandinavia as referring simply to the number of pieces whether it is lumber that is concerned, or timber, because it is very easy to count the number of pieces of timber, logs, huge timber, which is a very different thing to taking the number of pieces of sawn lumber. Does that bill of lading apply to both timber and lumber?

Mr. MEREDITH.—I will try to answer that, although I am not as well up in lumber as I should be. You refer to Scandinavia, this is the "Chamber of Shipping Wood Charter (Scandinavia and Finland), to the United Kingdom." Now when you get down to the schedule, it talks about, "St. Petersburg Standard Hundred", whatever that may mean, and here apparently is what the vessel would carry, "The steamer to be provided with a deck load, at full freight, at charterers' risk, not exceeding what she can reasonably stow and carry, over and above her tackle, apparel, provisions, and furniture;" &c., "and deliver the same, always afloat, on being paid freight as follows:—"I presume this is what the ship would have to carry: "For deals and battens, for boards, for boards under 1 in. thick, for scantlings, for ends for broken stowage, 8 feet and under, (two-thirds freight) for firewood", I presume that is what it would cover.

Mr. CROSBY.—That covers everything except timber.

The CHAIRMAN.—Could you indicate the clause in the charter party. That deals with the quantity and kind.

Mr. MEREDITH.—What I have read in regard to the kind of wood shipped is under the charter party marked 'A.' It covers Scandinavia and Finland, and what I would like to get the committee to bear in mind in considering the present Bill is that clause 6 of this charter party reads as follows (Reads):

The bills of lading to be prepared on the form endorsed on this charter, and shall be signed by the master, quality, condition and measure unknown, freight and all conditions, causes and exceptions as per this charter. The owner shall be responsible for the number of pieces signed for by the master or his duly authorized agents (fire and fraud excepted, perils of the seas and rivers, when the cargo is in the lighters, also excepted).

Endorsed on this bill of lading and the only clause that I would refer to at the end of the document is the one containing the following words (reads): 'Quality, condition and measure unknown.' Now, some explanation in reply to Dr. Daniel as

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

to what is shipped under the next charter party. The next one, which I will mark 'B' bears the following title: 'Chamber of Shipping Pitch Pine Charter, 1906, for the United Kingdom, European Continent and the Mediterranean. Arranged with the Timber Trade Federation of the United Kingdom.' Now as far as I can see what would be shipped under this charter would be sawn pitch pine timber and hewn pitch pine timber. Pitch pine, sawn timber, deals, battens, boards and scantlings. Clause 6 of this charter party reads as follows (Reads):

The bills of lading shall be prepared by the shippers of the cargo on the form endorsed on this charter and shall be signed by the master, quality and measure unknown, not accountable for splits and shakes unless caused by careless or improper handling, freight and all conditions, clauses and exceptions as per this charter.

The bill of lading is on the back and I would simply refer to this one clause which reads: 'quality and measure unknown. Steamer not responsible for splits or shakes unless caused by careless or improper handling.'

The CHAIRMAN.—Boards are included, are they not?

Mr. DANIEL.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—That means that they count the number of pieces in the cargo.

Mr. DANIEL.—It covers lumber, Mr. Meredith, before you go on I would like to ask you a question. The charter party you have just read from, or the one previously read, spoke of losses in lighters. Would that include the loss which was spoken of by the gentleman from St. John the other day where deals, for instance, are being slung from a lighter on board the vessel and some of them dropped into the water.

Mr. MEREDITH.—I think, Mr. Daniel, if you look at this charter party, and I would like to leave it with you, you will see that the clause reads: 'perils of the seas and rivers, when the cargo is in lighters, also excepted.' I should take that to mean that if there is any negligence on the part of the steamship owner, it would not relieve him from responsibility, but if the cargo is alongside in lighters, and if it begins to blow hard and the lighter loses a little bit of lumber, if some deals fall overboard, owing to the very bad weather and not through the negligence of the ship, I should think the ship would not be responsible for that loss under the clause that she is not responsible for perils of the seas and rivers.

Mr. CROSBY.—No.

Mr. LOGGIE.—The Baltic Charter spoke of pitch pine. Does the same rule apply to spruce deals? I did not hear you mention spruce deals but only pitch pine.

Mr. MEREDITH.—No sir, the charter party that I read from deals purely and simply with pitch pine.

Mr. LOGGIE.—And not with spruce deals?

Mr. MEREDITH.—No, sir.

Mr. LOGGIE.—Have you any charter party dealing with spruce deals from the Baltic?

Mr. MEREDITH.—It was the Mediterranean charter party I was quoting from. I notice that it does not say very much about timber, but I understand the Mediterranean charter party is with regard to pitch pine.

Mr. LOGGIE.—Are not spruce deals covered by the Scandinavian charter party?

Mr. DANIEL.—Yes. It covers deals and battens and boards one inch thick, scantlings, ends for broken stowage, eight feet and under, and firewood.

Mr. CROSBY.—They ship the same class of goods from the Baltic that we ship from Canada.

Mr. DANIEL.—Would this take in Norway?

APPENDIX No. 4

Mr. ROBB.—Scandinavia includes Finland.

Mr. MEREDITH.—I understand that will take in Norway.

Now, answer your question, Mr. Daniel, as to what is covered by these charter parties, dealing with the Timber Trade Shipping Wood charter party for Russia to the United Kingdom, that is to say Cronstadt, Riga and Memel, the goods that would be apparently shipped under the charter party are deals and battens, boards, scantlings and ends for broken stowage. These are apparently all the goods that are shipped under it.

Mr. LOGGIE.—Is the Bill of Lading endorsed on the back?

Mr. MEREDITH.—Yes. Before I get to that, the only clause in this charter party which I consider relevant to my case, is Clause No. 6, which is very similar to the clause which I have read from the others. (Reads):

"The bills of lading to be prepared on the form endorsed on this charter and shall be signed by the Master, quality, condition and measure unknown, freight and all conditions, clauses and exceptions as per this charter. The Owners shall be responsible for the number of pieces signed for by the Master or his duly authorized Agents, fire and fraud excepted. Perils of the Seas and Rivers when the Cargo is in Lighters also excepted".

That is very much, I think, the same as before, and this bill of lading is endorsed on the back of it, "Quality, condition and measure unknown," that is Exhibit "C", then the only other one is the one that I have filed as "D", which is the "Chamber of Shipping Baltic Sleeper Charter", which was adopted by the Baltic and White Sea Conference on the 17th of November, 1905, and that apparently covers the shipment of square or rectangular sleepers, and round or half round sleepers, and Clause 4 of that charter party reads as follows:

"The bills of lading to be prepared on the form endorsed on this charter party shall be signed by the Master for the number of pieces shipped on board or actually taken hold of by the steamers lifting tackle, and the owner shall only be responsible for the number of pieces so signed for, subject to the exceptions contained in Clause 5 hereof."

Clause 5 is rather long.

"5. The Act of God, the King's enemies, restraints of Princes and Rulers and perils of the sea excepted." etc.

Then at the back of this is endorsed.

BILL OF LADING.

Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom.
Baltic Sleeper, 1905.

and at the bottom is the remark:

"Quality, Condition and Measure Unknown."

Mr. KYTE.—Am I to understand that objections are made to our Act because the purchasers in Great Britain are refusing to accept bills of lading for pieces?

Mr. MEREDITH.—As far as I can make out from what Mr. Taylor and the gentlemen who have spoken in favour of striking out Clause 10 have said, they complain that they cannot negotiate their bills of lading with the bankers, as I understand it, in other words they cannot do business.

The CHAIRMAN.—Without a guarantee?

Mr. MEREDITH.—Yes. What I fail to understand is why there should be any trouble, why should Canadians find any trouble in doing business when they are

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

under the present Act, without any amendment to it, as far as I can see in exactly the same position as the men who sell timber from Russia, Scandinavia or the Mediterranean.

Mr. KYTE.—That is the point that occurs to me at this moment.

Mr. MEREDITH.—The fact of the matter is I did not know when I was here the other day of these bills of lading or these charter parties, and when I heard the statement made by gentlemen, who I have no doubt were absolutely reliable, to the effect that business could not be done under the present law without the guarantee, it seemed to me extraordinary. Business has been done before the Campbell Act came into force, and I have the evidence, I can prove it from the manager of the federation that the bills of lading did not guarantee the measurements of the deals that went on board the ship.

Mr. CROSBY.—In some cases.

Mr. MEREDITH.—In some cases it may have, but it was not universal and I have never heard from any of those people who ship, where they did not get measurement guaranteed by the ship, that they could not do business in England because the ship would not guarantee the measurement. The fact is that these people were shipping from the Mediterranean and Russia, and that they were doing business, and they are practically the greatest competitors of the Canadian timber shipper.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Was it the situation in New Brunswick too?

Mr. MEREDITH.—Yes, I think I am safe in saying this, I can support it by proof if necessary, although I did not want to go into it, but I will state this, and if Mr. Taylor wishes to contradict it he may, I am stating from what I consider reliable information, I think it may be said that for four years before the Campbell Act came into force, for about four years, wood goods were shipped on board the liners, by that I mean the large ships, and the responsibility of the ship for these wood goods was determined by the liner's bill of lading, and in the liner's bill of lading they used to put the words "Shippers measure said to be." There was no guarantee.

The CHAIRMAN.—What does that mean, "Shipper's measure said to be."

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Said to contain so much.

Mr. KYTE.—Was the number of pieces specified in the liner's bill of lading?

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Have you a copy of that form of bill of lading or charter party?

Mr. ROBB.—There is no charter party in the case of a liner.

The CHAIRMAN.—Was the number of pieces always specified in these bills of lading as far as your knowledge goes?

Mr. ROBB.—Yes, as far as my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN.—It was the invariable practice to specify the number of pieces?

Mr. ROBB.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—But there seem to be different methods of dealing with the measurement, sometimes in New Brunswick they guarantee the measurement and sometimes they do not?

Mr. ROBB.—Yes.

Mr. KYTE.—Mr. McKean admitted that these were the bills of lading used by the liners, but they only take part cargoes to fill up.

Mr. ROBB.—Parcels.

The CHAIRMAN.—In the St. Lawrence what was the practice?

Mr. ROBB.—As far as the St. Lawrence is concerned we have no complaints from any of our charters.

The CHAIRMAN.—Do you know if measurements were guaranteed by the tramp steamers?

Mr. ROBB.—There may be some, I do not know, but as a rule the proviso was always put in that the ship did not guarantee.

APPENDIX No. 4

Mr. TAYLOR.—You said, Mr. Robb, that the charter party and bill of lading I showed you did not make the ship responsible. I suppose you are basing your answer to the Chairman's question on similar information to that on which you have given an answer to my question?

Mr. ROBB.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is that a legal point?

Mr. ROBB.—A technical point.

Mr. MEREDITH.—We will put in this document as Exhibit "E", I will put it in for what it is worth, it is a lumber bill of lading of the Allan Line.

(Document filed as Exhibit E.)

Examination of Mr. Robb resumed:

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. You are Mr. Robb, manager of the Shipping Federation?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Shipping Federation includes what companies?—A. Well, it includes all the regular lines with the exception of the C.P.R. and also a number of tramp steamers.

Q. Do they include the steamships or steamship agents from the maritime provinces?—A. Well, the Nova Scotia Steel Company and the Dominion Steel Company, they are the more important lines.

Q. Plying on the St. Lawrence?—A. Plying on the St. Lawrence.

By Mr. Loggie:

Q. Is the Thompson Line included?—A. No, they are not included.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Then your experience is mostly with the business on the St. Lawrence?—A. Mostly.

Q. Will you tell us what has been the custom of the trade, what it has been customary to include in the bills of lading which have been given on the St. Lawrence by the members of your Association?—A. Well, this is the bill of lading which has been put in as Exhibit "E", that is the bill which has been in use in connection with the timber trade by nearly all the lines.

By Mr. Meredith, K.C.:

Q. Up to the passing of the Campbell Act?—A. Up to the Campbell Act.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Will you indicate to us the principal clauses of this bill of lading, those which bear upon the question which is now under discussion?—A. Well, take the first clause there, "Quantity and description of merchandise." You will see at the bottom of that schedule,"

"Shipper's Measure.

(Said to be)"

Q. Will you read it all?

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. So the ship owner does not take any responsibility as to the quantity?—A. No. The number of pieces will be stipulated there.

Q. They give the number of pieces in the first part of the back there?—A. Yes.

Q. And then below they give the shippers' measurement 'said to be'?—A. Said to be. Then if you go down you will see 'weight, quantity, measure, gauge, quality, condition, brand, contents and value unknown, 'and the ship owner not accountable for the same.'

Q. That is probably the clause which arrests the question just now under consideration?—A. Under consideration.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

By Mr. Todd:

Q. What charter party is this?—A. It is the bill of lading of the regular lines used by the principal lines.

By Mr. Meredith:

Q. Up to the time the Campbell Act came into force?—A. Came into force.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Now outside of these liners you have mentioned there are some other vessels carrying lumber in the St. Lawrence?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the nature of the bill of lading which was made by other steamers Is it the same as this one?—A. Their bill of lading is generally made in accordance with the charter party.

Q. The charter party which you mentioned a few minutes ago and which you have filed—No, it has not been filed yet?—A. That is one of the Canadian Timber Trade

Q. Will you read the clause which refers to the bill of lading?—A. (Reads):

8. The bill of lading shall be conclusive evidence against the owners of the quantity of the cargo shipped on board as stated therein; and in case of short delivery owners shall produce the log book and furnish an extended protest if demanded, showing the cause of such short delivery, before balance of freight becomes due or payable.

Q. Is there anything with regard to the measurement?—A. The bill of lading covers the measurement afterwards.

Q. Now will you read clause 11 of that charter party?—A. (Reads):

The usual custom of the wood trade of each port to be observed by each party in cases where not especially expressed.

Mr. CROSBY.—That has more to do with the manner of loading.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Would that clause have any bearing upon the question?—A. No, I have a bill of lading—

Q. Connected with this charter party?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please file it?—A. I have McLean-Kennedy & Company's bill of lading and I have marked the clause, which reads as follows:—(Reads):

The bills of lading to be signed, as presented without prejudice to this charter. Any difference in freight to be settled before the steamer's departure from port of loading. If in steamer's favour, in cash less insurance. If in charterer's favour by captain's draft upon his consignees, payable five days after arrival of steamer at port of discharge. Steamer to have an absolute lien upon the cargo for all freight, dead freight, and demurrage. Charterer's responsibility to cease when steamer is loaded and bills of lading are signed.

McLean, Kennedy & Company are the largest charterers we have in the St. Lawrence tramp steamship business.

Q. They belong to this association too?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. How many tramp steamers are there?—A. I should say twenty or thirty during the season.

Q. Trading in the St. Lawrence?—A. Yes, chiefly.

By Mr. Meredith:

Q. Have the Rexford's any?—A. Yes.

APPENDIX No. 4

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Have you got the bill of lading?—A. That is the bill of lading pinned on to the charter party.

Q. What you have quoted from is the charter party of McLean, Kennedy & Co.—A. There is a bill of lading, but I have not a copy with me. I thought it was pinned on to this charter party.

Q. Will you supply us with a copy?—A. Yes.

Q. And it will be filed as exhibit 'H'—Under the bill of lading which you produced a few minutes ago as Exhibit 'E' have the shippers of wood experienced any difficulty in having their bills of lading transferred to the banks?—A. No, we have never had any complaints so far as the regular lines are concerned. That bill of lading which I produced belongs to the regular lines. We have never had any complaints.

Q. There is no mention on the bill of lading of any superficial quantity of timber which was carried. A. No.

Q. And Shippers have never experienced any trouble with regard to the negotiating of their bills of lading?—A. No, there have been no complaints. I think Mr. McKean's evidence bore that out.

Q. Are you familiar with the circumstances in New Brunswick?—A. No.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR:—Because it seems to be the only province where any trouble has been experienced so far.

Mr. TAYLOR.—In Nova Scotia and Quebec also.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. Have you heard of any difficulty in the other provinces?—A. Nothing but what I heard the other day given in evidence here.

Q. I believe there is a large quantity of wood shipped from British Columbia. Have you heard of any trouble being met with there?—A. No, I have heard of no complaints.

Q. Do they ship there by the quantity of feet or by measurement?—A. As far as British Columbia is concerned, I cannot answer that.

Q. In the St. Lawrence, if I understand you aright, the custom is to ship by the quantity and not by measurement?—A. By the number of pieces.

Q. You are not familiar with the situation in New Brunswick?—A. No.

Q. Are there any cases in the St. Lawrence where agreements have been made between the shipper and the ship owner by which they could ship by measurement?—A. It is quite possible there may have been agreements.

Q. But you do not know of any?—A. No. We do not know of any.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. Are you speaking as to the St. Lawrence?—A. As to the St. Lawrence.

Q. Only as to St. Lawrence shipments?—A. And tramp steamers in the St. Lawrence. I have put in McLean, Kennedy & Company's charter party.

Mr. KYTE.—I would like to ask Mr. Taylor if he can offer any explanation as to why it is bills of lading based upon the Scandinavian Charters are negotiable in the banks of England, and the bills of lading under our Act are not.

Mr. TAYLOR.—In answer to that the fact remains that the English purchasers have refused absolutely our bills of lading in consequence of this Act. I do not know what arrangements they have made with regard to the Scandinavian bills of lading, but they have absolutely refused to accept ours, and we cannot do business without the guarantee. That is the position that we are put in by the Act.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Have you taken up the question to find out how far they were receiving bills of lading from the Baltic—

The CHAIRMAN.—And the St. Lawrence.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—And the St. Lawrence, which contains purely and simply the number of pieces while objecting to do the same thing for the New Brunswick trade.

Mr. TAYLOR.—The question has been taken up in every possible way with them and every effort has been made to get them to accede to our proposals. We have had conferences repeatedly with reference to this particular matter and to get our bills of lading accepted, and they have point blank refused to do it. Now we are hung up entirely with regard to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN.—Can you offer us any explanation of the fact that there is so much said about shortage in St. John shipments? That does not appear to be the case with regard to the shipments from the St. Lawrence and other places. Have you been able to find any solution of that?

Mr. TAYLOR.—I haven't heard of any great shortage in New Brunswick shipments, occasionally there is a slight shortage, but there is no very great shortage.

The CHAIRMAN.—If the purchasers on the other side were not having any difficulty with the cargoes from St. John they would not be asking guarantees, would they?

Mr. TAYLOR.—The shortage has been very slight, so slight that the ship owners have preferred to sign the bill of lading, and they have signed it rather than incur the trifling expense of 5 cents a thousand for having it surveyed.

Mr. CROSBY.—There is the question of saving of time.

Mr. TAYLOR.—It does not make any difference in the time, not a minute.

Mr. CROSBY.—The shipowners say there would be too much time consumed.

Mr. TAYLOR.—There would not be one minute's delay for a survey.

The CHAIRMAN.—You are only referring to a tally, you are not referring to a measurement by rule?

Mr. TAYLOR.—There is no need to put a rule on it, the sizes of the planks are already marked upon them in plain legible figures and all they have to do is to take down those marks. The ship has no responsibility except for what it receives according to the marks on the deals. The ship is not responsible for anything now except possibly the number of pieces. The situation, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, comes down to this that the purchasers on the other side have absolutely refused to accept the bill of lading, and the result has been the entire disorganization of the Canadian trade.

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—I am asking for my own information as I am anxious to get all the facts in connection with the question, but I would like Mr. Taylor to state who have refused?

Mr. TAYLOR.—The two associations in England, the Timber Trade Association of the North of England and the Bristol Channel Association have held meetings and absolutely refused to accept the present bill of lading.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—How is it they have received bills of lading coming from the St. Lawrence, that is what I would like to know?

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—How is it that the largest timber association in England has agreed to the form used in Russia, the Baltic, and the Mediterranean, which only provides for the number of pieces?

Mr. TAYLOR.—They have refused to accept it, and they have been tried in every possible way. There are people here who are acting for Messrs. Price & Geary, who are among the largest importers of timber from the north of Europe, and who are also large importers from Canada, they are absolutely familiar with all Mr. Robb has said about the timber business in the north of Europe and they realize there is a difficulty under the Canadian Act. It may seem extraordinary that the manufacturers of timber, the people who are shipping it from North Europe are able to make an agreement that is perfectly satisfactory to all parties and that we in Canada cannot make an agreement that is equally satisfactory. But no attempt has been made in North

APPENDIX No. 4

Europe to legislate regarding the different forms of agreement, and why should Canada legislate as to the form of charter party to be adopted by us?

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—That is another question altogether, and before going into that let me put a question, as I want to get all the information possible about that. How is it that the bills of lading which have been produced here from the St. Lawrence, for example, are being accepted in England, where the quantity is not determined, but simply the number of pieces, as to quantity they simply say, "Shipper's measurement said to be" so much. Now how is it that these bills of lading are accepted and yet similar bills of lading are not accepted as far as your province, or shipments from your province are concerned.

Mr. TAYLOR.—The situation is very different with regard to shipments made on tramp steamers as compared with shipments made on the Allan or C.P.R. liners where there is no loss. In the case of the liners the goods are carefully handled there is no loss loading, because they keep men in the boat, as Mr. McKean explained the other day, watching for deals which drop out of the slings while being loaded, and consequently there is no loss. But in tramp steamers—

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Yes, but Mr. Robb speaks to us also of tramp steamers on the St. Lawrence doing the same thing.

Mr. TAYLOR.—To my knowledge any ship coming to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick always signs this bill of lading as to quantity.

Mr. C. A. DUCLOS.—I can show you a charter party of a steamer at Barachois which did not sign except for the number of pieces only.

The CHAIRMAN.—You produced the other day, Mr. Taylor, a letter from the Bristol channel Timber Importers' Association which is addressed to 'F. & J.' who is 'F. & J.'?

Mr. TAYLOR.—Farr and Jardine of Liverpool.

The CHAIRMAN.—Now have you a copy of the letter to Farr & Jardine, to which the letter you produced was an answer?

Mr. TAYLOR.—I have not.

The CHAIRMAN.—I just wondered what they said to those people in that letter.

Mr. TAYLOR.—I understood it was a letter refusing to give the guarantee, and the purchasers refused to buy without the guarantee.

Examination of Mr. Robb resumed.

By Mr. Loggie:

Q. Do I understand you that that charter for wood in the St. Lawrence, where a tramp steamer is chartered for a full cargo, the conclusive evidence clause is omitted from the charter?—A. No, not in all cases.

Q. Then the conclusive evidence clause is, in some cases, included in charters for full cargoes from the St. Lawrence?—A. Yes, I believe it is.

Q. Is there any good reason why a tramp steamer entering into a bargain with a buyer on the other side should not agree to the conclusive evidence clause. In your experience have you known of hardships to a vessel carrying such a cargo under such a charter party?—A. I believe there have been a number of very hard cases where ships have been 'soaked' when they arrived at the other side.

Q. Can you get us some definite evidence as to that fact?—A. I can; I can cable to England and get evidence of the Underwriters' Association, in fact my friend here who represents some of the largest underwriters association can tell you of claims that vessel owners have had to meet.

Q. Now in view of the fact that it has been the custom of the trade for the last half century to make such a charter party with the conclusive evidence clause in the charter, is there any good reason why we, as a federal parliament, making laws now after fifty years' experience should step in and interfere between the carrier and the

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

shipper?—A. I think myself we should protect the small shipowners, the liners are able to protect themselves and we should protect the small shipowners, that clause 10 protects them, and you ought to protect them. For four years they tried to force that upon the liners at St. John but we have been able to stand firm and only accept the number of pieces.

Q. But it was very clearly brought out in the evidence given the other day that the liners who do not take that responsibility, carry the goods at a much less rate of freight, and why a shipowner who wishes to do so cannot enter into an agreement with a party to carry on certain conditions as to loading I cannot conceive unless you give me some more definite information?—A. I would not say the liners always take goods at a less rate of freight. They get an increased rate for small parcels.

By the Chairman:

Q. They get all they can?—A. They get all they can.

By Mr. Loggie:

Q. The evidence brought by the shippers from St. John is that the liners take parcels at a much less rate than an entire cargo?—A. If that was done we would carry all the lumber cargoes from St. John.

Q. How would you do that, when the lumber is carried during the summer and the liners do not frequent that port in the summer season?—A. We could carry it more cheaply if the lumber was shipped direct and there was no transshipment. It costs more where the cargo is shipped indirectly and involves transshipment.

Q. I quite understand that, but you said that if the rates were less you would carry all the lumber?—A. Yes, to direct ports.

Q. It has been the custom of the trade at Miramichi for during fifty years for the vessel owner to agree to the Conclusive Evidence clause, but he has the right to protect himself by tallying the cargo at a very nominal expense. When he signs his bills of lading according to the Conclusive Evidence clause he is responsible for the delivery of the pieces according to the marks. Would it not be fair that if the shipper were obliged to attach his specification, giving the number of pieces, the lengths and widths, attached to the bill of lading?—A. I do not think there would be any objection to attach the specification to the bill of lading, but I would object to making it part of the bill of lading. You could attach it but not make it a part of the bill of lading.

Q. Why do you object?—A. Because it is impossible for the ship owner to tally the measurement of these goods. You heard one of the gentlemen who attended the meeting of this Committee explaining the number of months it took to measure a cargo in the London docks. He said it was three or four months before they could get a return of the output of the cargo. Well how long is it going to take us to measure that cargo.

Q. You misunderstand me, that is not what I meant to convey at all. Every piece of deal is marked and I have stood beside the tallyman many a time and beside the ship and seen the deals going on board, and I do not believe there is any difficulty in having an expert tally man tally those pieces of deal as quickly as they could be put into the sling. Do not misunderstand me. It simply means tallying a stick fifteen by nine, meaning fifteen feet long and nine feet wide, and then making a specification of that—A. How is it possible we could know that was fifteen feet?

Q. I do not care about that, that is not the question just now. What I want to get at is, would it not be fair if the ship-owner were obliged to deliver according to the marks not according to the actual measurement—A. We do that now according to the marks. We deliver the number of pieces.

Q. There is where you and I differ. For example there might be a deal twenty two feet long, and if it were cut in two it would make two deals eleven feet long and

APPENDIX No. 4

the ship would only be obliged to deliver the number of pieces, and get if they had parted with eleven feet the measurement would be short?—A. Then you suggest that it is open to the ship to count the two pieces. If it is open to the ship it is also open to the lighter that brings them alongside to count the pieces.

Q. But the ship accepts no responsibility until the lumber is alongside. The tally man is there checking his tally off and every deal is marked. That is the practice. At any rate you would have no objection to the specification being attached?—A. If it is not made part of the bill of lading.

Q. It would be I suppose so many pieces according to the specification?—A. That practically means measurement. We certainly would object to that.

Q. Suppose there would be 100 pieces fifteen to nine?—A. How are we to know that there would be that many pieces unless we made a measurement?

Q. But they are marked?—A. They are marked with a piece of chalk. Can not that mark be rubbed off and become obliterated? How are we to know that that deal in the exact length?

Q. Because a sworn surveyor has put the mark on it, it comes from the mill and goes into a pile where it is almost impossible for the mark to be obliterated unless it was a rainy day or something like that. And even if it disappears it is not a very difficult matter for the tally man to know the length.

Mr. DANIEL.—Where is the mark placed on the deal?

Mr. LOGGIE.—On the end of the deal, on the flat part of it.

Mr. DANIEL.—At both ends?

Mr. LOGGIE.—No, at the end only.

Mr. DANIEL.—If a sling of deals is being put on a vessel—

Mr. LOGGIE.—They are tallied before they are put on the sling as they are lifted off the lighter and very clearly and distinctly marked, and to my mind there is no difficulty in doing what I suggest except that a man need to be somewhat of an expert and used to that class of work. I think it is only fair that the ship should be responsible for the marks that are on the deal, not necessarily on the contents as to cargo measurement. That seems to me a fair proposition and one which would meet the situation.

The WITNESS.—If it was possible for the ship to check the measurement I would say so, but it is not possible. I think it would be a very great hardship, as I believe it has been in the past.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. I see that in the charter party of Messrs, McLean, Kennedy and Co., marked exhibit G. this provision (reads):

“For timber under deck.—If discharged at Montevideo or if ordered to Buenos Aires, on signing of Bills of Lading..... per thousand superficial feet, inch measure, intake survey.”

If ordered to discharge at Buenos Aires, after arrival at Montevideo.....per thousand superficial feet inch measure, intake survey, &c.

Would not this expression “per thousand superficial feet,” lead us to believe that it provided for the quantity as well as for the number of pieces?—A. In the bill of lading we would simply put: “Shippers’ measure..... said to be.”

The CHAIRMAN.—But the Minister asks what is the force of that in the Charter party.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—In the charter party where the payment has to be made on the quantity.

The WITNESS.—That would be put in there practically so that there could be some standard for drawing against the number of feet; the bank would not advance unless you had a certain number of superficial feet to draw against, whatever the number of

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

pieces of a certain size, that will determine the number of superficial feet, and that gives the amount they would be willing to advance upon.

By Hon. Mr. Brodeur:

Q. That has no reference at all to the relations between the bank and the ship, that relates to the relations between the owner of the vessel and the charterer. Coming then to the other charter party which you have produced as Exhibit "F" entitled, "Canadian Timber and Deal Charter (Quebec and Above)", Section 8 says:

"The bill of lading shall be conclusive evidence against the owners of the quantity of cargo shipped on board as stated therein;"

So that under the new Act which has been passed this clause would have to be removed, it is contrary to law?—A. Yes.

Q. This is the contract which has been in existence for a number of years?—A. Yes.

Q. And you never heard any complaint with regard to that?—A. There has been no complaint.

Q. Is it necessary then to pass a law declaring that if such a clause is put in it will be an illegal contract?—A. I think as the section stands now it is illegal if you put in such a clause.

Q. We are considering the clause now, and I want to find out the reason why it was put in. The Parliament of Canada passed a law last year declaring that if a contract were made between a shipper and a shipowner specifying that there was in the vessel a certain quantity of timber that contract would be illegal. What reason would there be for passing such a law?—A. You mean for removing this clause, taking the clause out?

Q. No, no, for passing such legislation in the first place, I want to know the reason why it was passed?—A. I think that as far as we are concerned we have nothing to do with that clause which came in from our New Brunswick friends, but it is a very fair clause, it is looked upon as fair, as far as the shipowners are concerned.

Q. But if I understand you right, if I may judge by the bills of lading and charter parties brought before us, a system has prevailed for years by which the quantity in feet was given in the charter party or bill of lading; was it therefore necessary to pass a law declaring such to be illegal when everything, judging by what you have said, seemed to be going on fairly well?—A. Well, this Water Carriage of Goods Act interfered with the freedom of contract between the shipowner and the shipper, in the case of wood goods there had to be an exception otherwise it would have been a very serious thing for the shipowner if he were made responsible for the quantity.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—But this shipowner was perfectly free to refuse to give any such bill of lading as that, why should we, by legislation, make it illegal, that is what I want to know?

Mr. CROSBY.—Mr. Robb might ask you why you made that law.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—I did not make this law, Section 10 was not in the bill as I introduced it, it was put in by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN.—I see Mr. Robb's point very clearly. Before this bill was passed at all there was freedom of contract between the shipper and the merchant, but by clause 2 of the Act you prevent freedom of contract between the shipowner and the shipper; you have made it necessary that the shipowner should protect himself. Prior to that he could put something in his bill of lading showing that he was not responsible for measurement, but you have prevented him doing that.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—I think before the law was passed he was not responsible for measurement.

WITNESS.—If you withdraw that Clause 10 the shipowner is responsible for the measurement.

APPENDIX No. 4

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—No, it will be a question of contract.

The CHAIRMAN.—No, he cannot, under the Act, protect himself.

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—I do not want to take up the time of the committee but in answer to your question I would say that if you take out Clause 10, under Clause 4 of the Campbell Bill, as we call the Act that is now in force, the shipowner could not contract to have himself held not liable for measurement.

Mr. MCKENZIE.—What does Clause 4 say?

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—Clause 4 says:

“Where any bill of lading or similar document of title to goods contains any clause, covenant or agreement whereby—

(a) The owner, charterer, master or agent of any ship, or the ship itself, is relieved from liability for loss or damage to goods arising from the negligence, fault or failure in the proper loading, stowage, custody, care of delivery of goods received by them or any of them to be carried in or by the ship; or,

(b) Any obligations of the owner or charterer of any ship to exercise due diligence to properly man, equip and supply the ship, and make and keep the ship seaworthy, . . . are in any wise lessened, weakened or avoided; or,

(c) The obligations of the master, officers, agents or servants of any ship to carefully handle and stow goods, and to care for, preserve and properly deliver them, are in any wise lessened, weakened or avoided;

such clause, covenant or agreement shall be illegal, null and void, and of no effect, unless such clause, covenant or agreement is in accordance with the other provisions of this Act.”

Now in Clause 9 of that Act it is provided:

“Every owner, charterer, master or agent of any ship carrying goods, shall on demand issue to the shipper of such goods a bill of lading showing, among other things, the marks necessary for identification as furnished in writing by the shipper, the number of packages or pieces, or the quantity or the weight, as the case may be, and the apparent order and condition of the goods as delivered to or received by such owner, charterer, master or agent; and such bill of lading shall be prima facie evidence of the receipt of the goods as herein described.”

In this Act, which the shipowner never asked for, he was prevented from putting in a clause in the bill of lading which relieved him of responsibility for shortage in delivery.

Mr. TAYLOR.—What clause in the Act prevents him?

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—The negligence clause.

Mr. TAYLOR.—That is for negligence in the loading, stowage, custody, care or delivery of the goods.

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—Supposing when a vessel arrives in Liverpool, and we have taken on board a whole lot of deals from lighters, and the shipper's measurement is mentioned in the bill of lading, under this bill we have to put in the shipper's measurement, he gives us the quantity and we have to put it in, but when we arrive at Liverpool we are short. Now, what happens? We are sued, and without Clause 10 the moment there is a shortage on the other side, we, having signed for the quantity, have to pay.

Mr. TAYLOR.—Under the Act you do not have to put in any quantity, if you know the number of pieces.

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—I would ask anybody to look at Clause 9 and say that I am not right.

Mr. TAYLOR.—You must have had it in mind when you accepted the bill before.

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—Look at clause 9: ‘Every owner, charterer, master or agent of any ship carrying goods, shall on demand issue to the shipper of such goods—’

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

We have to do it——‘a bill of lading showing among other things, the marks necessary for identification as furnished in writing by the shipper, the number of packages or pieces, or the quantity or the weight, as the case may be.’ Now supposing you take out Clause 10 and the shipper comes to the shipowner and says: ‘Give me a bill of lading showing the quantity,’ and the shipper gives to the shipowner the measurement, under Section 9 the shipowner has to give a bill of lading with that measurement on it.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—Are you very sure on that point? First, you have got to put on the marks necessary for identification as furnished in writing by the shipper. Second, the number of packages or pieces or the quantity or the weight as the case may be. Could not the shipowner give the number of pieces or the quantity? It is a matter for him to decide.

Mr. MEREDITH.—It is a matter for the shipper to decide.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—No the ship-owner.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Suppose the shipper comes and says ‘I am not going to put in my bill of lading the number of pieces but so many feet,’ the shipowner is obliged to give him a Bill of Lading. The one is at the option of the shipper, but the other is an obligation of the ship-owner.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—First, he will have to give the marks in writing to him then the number of packages and the quantity or weight and the third condition required is, “the apparent order and condition of the goods as delivered to, or received, by such owner, charterer, master or agent.” I am under the impression reading this clause that the ship-owner will have the right to give either the quantity or the number of pieces.

Mr. MEREDITH.—If that is the case my learned friends do not need anything more than is in the Act at present. I do not think that is what is meant. I think the promoters of the Act must construe it as I construe it; if they do not there is no necessity for section 10. If your contention, Mr. Minister, is correct, the ship-owners could say to the shippers: ‘We will only give you a bill of lading containing the number of pieces, we will not give you a bill of lading stating the quantity.’

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—But the law declares that if I do not give the quality or the weight it will be illegal.

Mr. TAYLOR.—And you would render yourself liable to a fine of a thousand dollars.

Mr. MCKENZIE.—Suppose there was no clause 10 and you were taking a cargo of bricks. Would you, if the shipper insisted on it, have to acknowledge the number of bricks on board?

Mr. ROBB.—Yes we would have to count the number of bricks.

Q. If that be true in the case of bricks why make a distinction in the case of wood?—A. Well it has to be measured in the case of wood.

Mr. MEREDITH.—We take the responsibility of the number of pieces.

Mr. ROBB.—The same as in the case of bricks.

Mr. MEREDITH.—The thing we are troubled about is the measurement

Mr. ROBB.—Yes, as to measurement.

By Mr. Taylor:

Q. You agreed, did you to the Campbell Bill in the Senate concerning clause 10? A. No, I think that was Mr. Meredith.

Q. Were you not there yourself?—A. Not at the last.

Q. But you were there before the Senate Committee. A. Yes, but not at the conclusion.

Witness discharged.

APPENDIX No. 4

Mr. MEREDITH.—As far as the Campbell Bill is concerned I want to be perfectly frank about it. That measure was introduced originally in the Senate and it was much more onerous when introduced than it is now.

Mr. DANIEL.—Onerous on whom?

Mr. MEREDITH.—On the ship-owner. It was very much more onerous when introduced than in its present form. As one of the Counsel engaged in the ship-owners' behalf I came to the conclusion, after the measure had been before the Senate a short time, that it was in the interest of my clients to enter into an agreement to accept this Bill rather than prolong the already long discussion in the Senate. We accepted the measure because we feared something worse might happen to us. I mean to say there were certain indications which might have meant that we would have had a measure which would have been far more onerous than was what I may call the compromise Bill. This Bill did not go through the Senate that year because there was a great deal of business before the House. However it was re-introduced, in the same form as the compromise Bill, in this House. I will be perfectly frank and say that when it came up for discussion—and I think the records of this Committee will establish the fact—I refused to ask for any amendment to the Bill because I had agreed to the compromise Bill in the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes, I remember.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Clause 10 was introduced without my making any application for it. I did think, although I did not say a word with regard to it, that it was a fair clause, but I could not ask for it because I felt bound by what I had said in the Senate. Now that clause having been introduced without any demand from the parties who were obliged under the compromise, without our having moved to get it in any possible way—directly or indirectly—it seemed to me fair that the ship-owner should say whether it is a fair clause to hold on to. It is not as though we were a party to its having been introduced, I felt that I could not be a party to its introduction, but when it was put through without any endeavour or any effort on the part of the shipowners, who had agreed to a compromise bill, it seemed to me it was open to all ship-owners to state to the Committee why the clause should remain. I would far sooner, as far as I am concerned, and I may say my learned friends who are with me, representing other interests, large interests, agree with me, as far as I am concerned as Counsel for the Shipping Federation, and also as Counsel for the C.P.R. steamers, which do not belong to the federation and are the only trans-Atlantic Line that do not belong to it.

Mr. CROSBY.—Why do they not belong, will you not take them in?

Mr. MEREDITH.—We would be glad to have them come in and to have every one join it because it is simply a federation for looking after the improvement of the laws and aids to navigation.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. The Shipping Federation has been of great service to the interests of navigation.

Mr. MEREDITH.—And I invite any shipowner to join it as the Association is doing what I consider very good work in promoting the interests of navigation. Therefore, representing a large body comprising all the trans-Atlantic liners, as I understand it, and as specially representing the C.P.R., which does not belong to the Federation, I would very much sooner see Clause 10 go out with a proviso in the Campbell Act that it does not cover wood goods at all, than to tinker with this Bill or to allow the thing to go on for all time. I do not want to have this come up every year; you have one class before the Committee now, that is the wood men and the people who caused the Campbell Bill to come into force were the flour men and as representing these different shipowners I would prefer to get rid of this whole thing by having the Act declare that it does not cover wood goods at all. Leave the people who ship wood goods free to contract with the steamship owners the same as they were before the Campbell Act came into force.

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

MR. TAYLOR.—I may say that we are quite willing to accept that, that is all we ask.

HON. MR. BRODEUR.—Do you know the consequences?

MR. TAYLOR.—The Bill will not apply to us at all then.

HON. MR. BRODEUR.—The consequence will be that they will contract themselves out of any liability on the shipment of your goods.

MR. MEREDITH, K.C.—I do not think that is quite fair. The Minister says we will contract ourselves out of any liability: what it will mean is this that there will be competition for the carrying of wood goods, the wood goods will go over just the same, and I presume the people who want to ship them will ship them on the line that will give them the best conditions, that is what it will mean. Now Mr. Campbell did not want to ship his flour like that, but these gentlemen are prepared to have freedom of contract, they will make a deal with us and will put any conditions in our bill of lading that are agreed upon.

HON. MR. BRODEUR.—And stipulate that if there is any negligence upon the part of the shipowners they will not be liable.

MR. MEREDITH.—We may or we may not. The shipper, of course, need not accept that, he can have his own ship or he can charter a ship, he can make his own arrangements and can get his lumber shipped as he wants to. From the shipowner's standpoint the whole of this Campbell Act is contrary to British usage, it does away with liberty of contract and prevents the shipowner from entering into a contract with people who want to ship goods. The flour people did not want to have liberty of contract and would not give the steamship owner liberty to contract. I, for one, think the lumber people are prepared to adopt the law in England, which gives liberty of contract. I, for one, representing these people, have not had an opportunity to consult them very much, but I think I can bind them to this, that if this is going to be the end of it, take the wood goods out of the Campbell Act altogether and leave us where we were before that measure came into force with regard to wood goods. I would be prepared to do the same thing with regard to every other commodity, but that would not suit the flour people.

MR. WALSH.—I represent the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and certainly we will not agree to any condition of that kind.

THE CHAIRMAN.—You want to maintain the Act as it is.

MR. WALSH.—Well, so far as that is concerned we did not appear when the Bill came up in the Senate but we did appear before the committee a year ago and we were then in favour of the Bill as it came before this committee. Mr. Meredith, on behalf of the Shipping Federation, stated that he was agreeable to the Bill as it was then presented. After that Clause 10 was inserted, certain other modifications were then made in favour of the shipowners, they were all for it at the time and finally it was agreed upon. There were no representatives of shippers by tramp steamers, there was no one here familiar with the conditions, representing the shippers. We have in our association shippers of all kinds, we have nearly 3,000 members, and we export lumber among other things and I was not familiar with the conditions presented by Mr. Taylor and by the gentlemen who were here a week ago. Now Section 10 in the Act to my mind fully protects the carrier, there is no question about it, he is simply required to give a receipt for the goods in accordance with what is furnished by the shipper, no more and no less, that is all he is required to deliver at the destination. Now he is not in any different position from any other carrier. There is another feature in connection with this legislation which has not been brought out, I might go back a little, this matter was brought up first by the Flour Association of London, England, they fought it out as conditions were then entirely different from the conditions that prevailed in the United States ports. They suggested that we should have as favourable conditions for shipment by Canadian ports as were enjoyed by those who shipped from United States ports. In

APPENDIX No. 4

other words that we should have the same provisions as existed in the Harter Act. We have not asked for anything more than that, we have not got anything more in the original Act; in fact we have less in this Clause 10. All we want is to be put in the position that we will have the same conditions when shipping by a Canadian port as if we shipped by Portland, New York, Philadelphia or Boston. The Bill as introduced in this committee was in that shape, there was too much business in the House of Commons, or something, and it didn't go through and it came back to this committee where this clause was inserted.

Mr. DANIEL.—You object to wood goods being taken out of the Act?

Mr. WALSH.—I do not see what is going to be gained by taking them out.

Mr. MEREDITH, K.C.—I want to understand the situation. I understand that Mr. Taylor, representing the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick people, who complained about Clause 10 is satisfied with my suggestions?

Mr. TAYLOR.—I also represent the shippers who control nine-tenths of the shipments from Quebec.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Who do you represent, Mr. Walsh?

Mr. WALSH.—I represent the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. MEREDITH.—What shippers belong to that Association?

Mr. WALSH.—A number of shippers, some of those gentlemen who were here, Mr. Gregory, who appeared before the committee the other day is a member of our Association.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Is he not also represented by Mr. Taylor?

Mr. WALSH.—Yes.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Then Mr. Taylor has to do with him. What I want to get at is, and it is important so far as my clients are concerned, to arrive at some conclusion, Mr. Duclos and Mr. Creelman can speak for themselves.

Mr. C. A. DUCLOS.—I represent the North of England Indemnity Association, the United Kingdom Association and the Cairn Line of steamships.

Mr. J. J. CREELMAN, Montreal.—I represent the United Kingdom Mutual Steamship Assurance Company, Limited, of London, England, the Standard Steamship Owners Protection and Indemnity Association, Limited, of London, England, the Standard Shipowners Mutual Freight, Dead Freight, Demurrage and Defence Association, Limited; the Furness Withy Line and the Manchester Liners.

Mr. MEREDITH.—In order to arrive at a compromise and to get rid of this thing I would suggest that Clause 10 be taken out, provided that Section 2, subsection (a) reads as follows:

Have you got the Act before you gentlemen?

The CHAIRMAN.—What you propose is provided wood goods are exempted from the operation of the Act.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Yes, provided wood goods are exempted from the operation of the Act. Subsection (a) now provides that the Act shall not affect so and so. The definition 'goods' includes goods, wares, merchandise and articles of any kind whatsoever, excepting live animals. I would like to know if that is agreeable to Mr. Taylor, who represents important interests.

Mr. TAYLOR.—I represent practically the entire lumber trade of the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and also parties who control nine-tenths of the lumber shipped in the province of Quebec.

Mr. MEREDITH.—My proposition will simply mean that the lumber people will not be under the Act.

Mr. WARBURTON.—Then you strike out Section 10.

Mr. TODD.—I have been listening to this discussion right through and I desire to say as one of the committee, that when Clause 10 was brought before us the shipping interest was largely represented and the matter was discussed very fully. The clause in question was finally left to a subcommittee of two members to draft something that

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

would be satisfactory to all parties. The Act went into force and it is now represented by lumbermen in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and others that there is a certain amount of unfairness in the operation of Clause 10. Still as one quite fair to withdraw wood goods entirely from this Act, I feel that the shippers of lumber in New Brunswick are perhaps asking too much when they require a shipowner to guarantee the quantity of lumber taken on board, but I also feel that the shipowner should take the lumbermen's specification which they furnish and which can be tallied out when the lumber is being lightered into the vessel, they should sign a bill of lading and agree to the marks that are on these deals, battens and ends, but I think it would be impracticable for the ship to sign for the quantity. I understand when they do not sign for the superficial quantity, the banks in some cases refuse to take that specification. It seems to me that the banks cannot rightly refuse to accept the lumbermen's specification, and I feel, in justice to the shipowners, that they should not be obliged to sign for the quantity. Now, I have been reading over Clause 9, and think it covers fully what has been stated here. It is not necessary for Clause 10 to be in the Act at all. I would move that after the word "goods" in the second line of Clause 9 we insert the words 'Wood or otherwise.' In that way we will provide for wood goods and Clause 10 can be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Act provides for that now.

Mr. MEREDITH.—It covers all kinds of goods.

Mr. TODD.—Under that it seems to me that the ship owner has got to furnish to the shipper a specification that he has got certain deals, length, and a certain number of pieces, but it does not oblige him to sign for the quantity or measurement. If you feel that 'wood goods' should not be put in, then I should feel disposed to strike out clause 10, as has been suggested.

Mr. MEREDITH.—May I say one word in answer to that? It seems to me, sir, the difficulty there is this—and I have thought of that very amendment, I may say. Your idea, I presume, was that the shipper would give a specification.

Mr. TODD.—Yes.

Mr. MEREDITH.—And attach that to the bill of lading and the specification would show the dimensions.

Mr. TODD.—Yes, the dimensions.

Mr. MEREDITH.—That would be attached to the bill of lading and then I presume your idea would be that the shipowners would be responsible for the pieces of these dimensions.

Mr. TODD.—On the specifications.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Then that practically means that the shipowner would be responsible for the number of pieces and the measurement.

Mr. TODD.—Not the measurement.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Yes, if you attached the specification which is really the measurement to the bill of lading. Then when the ship got to the other side and everything was not delivered, the man who bought that stuff at the other end of the voyage goes to the shipowner and says: 'Here is my bill of lading, here is the specification, and the stuff that came off that ship is not according to those dimensions, it is not according to the specification, which means that there is not the proper measurement, Pay me for the shortage.'

Mr. LOGGIE.—If it is according to the marks.

Mr. MEREDITH.—Not according to the marks, but according to the specification which deals with measurement.

Mr. TODD.—Now suppose the shipowner was obliged to allow a tallyman to tally the pieces that went on board with chalk marks on. Suppose there are one hundred pieces of certain dimensions, he does not measure the actual length, width or thickness of those pieces, but by means of the chalk marks placed on the pieces he can check over with the shipper's specification. The ship can then sign to deliver on the other side those pieces marked in that way.

APPENDIX No. 4

Mr. CROSBY.—That is what he does now under the Act.

Mr. TODD.—I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is what is done now, but some member of the committee raised the point the other day that when there was a shortage it would be impossible to say what sticks were short.

Mr. TODD.—If a man signs his specification that he has furnished so many pieces of certain sizes, it is the gross number of pieces.

Mr. CROSBY.—He is bound to deliver the number of pieces exactly as taken on board.

Mr. MCKENZIE.—The other day when Mr. Gregory was giving his evidence I followed him very closely and I will do him the credit of saying he put his case very strongly. The only point in which I agreed with him was that they should have sufficient data to identify the sticks or pieces that went aboard. I thought he should have that. I was not then familiar with clause 9. I think that clause 9 provides that and only that.

It says: "Every owner, charterer, master or agent of any ship carrying goods, shall on demand issue to the shipper of such goods a bill of lading showing, among other things, the marks necessary for identification", it does not say that the marks shall furnish quantities, but for the identification of the particular goods that are furnished; I think the shipper is entitled to that. It is contained in Clause 9, and if Clause 9 is good law let Clause 10 go out.

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Meredith that includes the quantity as well.

Mr. MCKENZIE.—I think that has reference to the class of goods. If it were coal it would be quantity, or if it were stone or something of that kind.

Mr. LOGGIE.—Would that mean marks on deals?

Mr. MCKENZIE.—Yes, I think that is sufficient to prove identification. I am only speaking for myself and I was satisfied that we could amend Section 10 to the extent of having that identification provision in it, but as long as it is in Section 9 it would not be necessary to have it in two places.

Mr. TAYLOR.—I do not know whether it has been mentioned to the committee but we have filed with the Minister of Marine a petition from some 600 people interested in the lumber business in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec, signed by practically all the parties of any importance at all in the lumber trade, and there was also transmitted a copy of a resolution of the assembly of the province of New Brunswick asking for the repeal of Section 10. We have found as a practical matter of business that we cannot do business with Section 10 in force. All the evidence introduced by Mr. Meredith in this case along the line of showing that contracts were made along a certain line in North Europe, there has been nothing produced here suggesting that anywhere else in the world is there legislation existing preventing the making of a contract such as is ordinarily made in business. It has been pointed out that there is an important trade springing up between Canada and Australia, South Africa and South America in wood goods which it is impossible to carry on under this section. We respectfully ask for the repeal of this section. We got along very well before this Act passed, we had no trouble, we had a charter party which was accepted, but this Act has caused an uproar in the English trade and the people of New Brunswick have been prevented from doing business there, they cannot sell their goods, the purchasers will not buy them, and this is causing a great deal of hardship. We have no objections to wood goods being eliminated from the Water Carriage of Goods Act, and we have no objection to Clause 2 of that Act being amended as Mr. Meredith suggests, but we do ask that Clause 10 be struck out. This trade amounts to \$10,000,000 in a year and Section 10 does not do any good to any interest. As against that the uncontradicted evidence before the committee is that the operation of Section 10 will cause a loss of upwards of \$200,000 a year to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

The CHAIRMAN.—How is that, Mr. Taylor?

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

Mr. TAYLOR.—We will have to check delivery on output of the vessel in England.

The CHAIRMAN.—The ship will have to do that; will not the ship have to do that in order to protect herself?

Mr. TAYLOR.—The ship, under this Act, would not have to do it in my opinion; we would have to do it—because the ship is only responsible under the Act for the pieces.

The CHAIRMAN.—Now I understand you to estimate the shortage at \$200,000 a year?

Mr. TAYLOR.—Not the shortage, but the cost of this survey on the other side; it has been estimated at \$120,000 a year for New Brunswick and \$60,000 for Nova Scotia, that is Mr. McKean's estimate, that is not the shortage but the cost of the survey.

Mr. DANIEL.—And that will come back on the manufacturer?

Mr. TAYLOR.—It is a very serious situation, and it does not do anybody any good. At least the only people who do benefit, as a matter of fact, are some Norwegian and Swedish, foreign, tramp steamers.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is a question of who is going to lose it.

Mr. TAYLOR.—It is not a question exactly of who will lose it, the ship is on the spot and checks it on delivery. The officers of the ship are there and can look after delivery of the cargo; we cannot send a man to Australia or to the Argentine to check it, we could get it checked in England but it costs a large amount of money to do it there, and in foreign ports it will be impossible to do so.

Mr. MEREDITH.—The amendment I suggested you approve of?

Mr. TAYLOR.—Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE.—If the committee takes out Section 10 and amends Section 2, so that wood goods will not be included under the operation of the Act at all, there will be freedom of contract.

Committee adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
ROOM 32,

TUESDAY, May 9, 1911.

The Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries met at 11 o'clock a.m., and proceeded to the further consideration of clause 10, Water Carriage of Goods Act.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR.—At the last meeting of the committee, Mr. Robb, of the Shipping Federation, agreed to furnish us with a bill of lading used by Messrs. McLean, Kennedy & Co. I have received a letter from that gentleman inclosing bill of lading, together with an explanatory letter from the manager of McLean, Kennedy & Co. (Reads):—

218 BOARD OF TRADE BUILDING,

MONTREAL, May 8, 1911.

DEAR MR. BRODEUR,—Referring to your request at the Committee of Marine and Fisheries, to be supplied with a copy of the bill of lading used by Messrs. McLean, Kennedy & Co., I now have pleasure of inclosing you same, also letter addressed to me and signed by their manager, giving the custom before and after the Water Carriage of Goods Act was passed.

Trusting this will serve your purpose.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) THOMAS ROBB.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR, K.C., LL.D.,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ont.

APPENDIX No. 4

McLEAN, KENNEDY & Co.,
STEAMSHIP BROKERS AND AGENTS.

THOS. ROBB, Esq.,
Manager,

Shipping Federation of Canada,
Montreal, P.Q.

119 AND 120 CORISTINE BUILDING,
MONTREAL, May 8, 1911.

DEAR SIR,—We beg to inclose specimen copy of B/L generally used on tramp steamers loading full cargoes of lumber from the St. Lawrence, from which you will note that we do not sign for measurement, nor do the shippers ask us to do so.

During the season of 1910, we handled from the St. Lawrence upwards of 25,000 standards of deals, and in every case signed only for the number of pieces. This custom was in force in the St. Lawrence both before and after the Water Carriage of Goods Act was passed, therefore this Act did not effect the lumber business in the St. Lawrence in any way.

Yours truly,

McLEAN, KENNEDY & CO.

Per WM. R. EAKEN,
Manager

24954 pieces spruce deals, marked J. B. C.

The Ship to be in no way liable for any consequences of the Act of God, Perils of the Sea, Fire, Barratry of the Master and Crew, Enemies, Pirates and Thieves, Arrest and Restraint of Princes, Rulers, and People or Quarantine Restrictions of whatever Nature or kind. Collisions, Standing, and other accidents or Errors of Navigation also excepted, even when occasioned by the Negligence, Default or Error in Judgment of the Pilot, Master, Mariners, or other servants of the shipowners. The vessel to have liberty to call at any port or ports in any order, to take Bunker Coals, or other supplies, and to sail without pilots and to void, to tow and be towed, and assist vessels in distress, and to deviate for the purpose of saving life or property. Ship not answerable for losses through explosion, bursting of boilers, breaking of shafts or any latent defect in the machinery, or hull not resulting from want of due diligence by the Owners of the Ship or any of them, or by the Ship's husband or Manager.

Dated at Three Rivers, this 21st day of August, 1910.

By authority of captain.

(Sgd.) McLEAN, KENNEDY & CO.

Pro. WM. R. EAKEN,
Agents.

Specimen copy of B/L used on tramp steamers.

McLean, Kennedy & Co.

p. pro. W. R. Eaken.

Committee adjourned.

'Shipped, in good order and condition by J. Burstall & Co., of Quebec, in and upon the good steamship or vessel called the "Craigendoran," whereof Findlay is master for this present voyage, and now lying in the Port of Three Rivers and bound for Glasgow, viz.: Twenty-four thousand nine hundred and fifty-four pieces spruce deals, being marked and numbered as per margin, to be delivered in like good order and well-conditioned at the aforesaid port of Glasgow unto order of shippers or their assigns, he or they paying freight for the said goods as per London Chamber of Commerce form of charter party dated June 1, 1910, at the rate of thirty-five shillings sterling, per St. Petersburg Standard Hundred, with average accustomed. All provisions and exceptions of the said Charter Party are incorporated herein whether in favour of the shipowner, shipper or holder of bill of lading. In witness whereof the master of the said ship hath affirmed to four bills of lading, all of this tenor and date, one of which being accomplished, the rest to stand void.'

1-2 GEORGE V., A. 1911

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
COMMITTEE ROOM No. 32,
TUESDAY, May 9, 1911.

The committee met at 11 o'clock, a.m., Mr. Sinclair, the chairman, presiding.

Present:—Messrs. Brodeur, Chisholm (Inverness), Daniel, Jameson, Kyte, McKenzie, Sperry, Todd, Turgeon and Warburton.

The committee proceeded to the further consideration of section 10 of the Water Carriage of Goods Act.

On motion of Mr. Warburton, seconded by Mr. Todd, it was resolved that paragraph (a) of section 2 of chapter 61, 1909-10, be repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—(a) 'goods' includes goods, wares, merchandise and articles of any kind whatsoever, except that it does not include live animals or lumber, deals and other articles usually described as 'wood goods.' And also that section 10 be struck out.

On motion of Mr. Brodeur, it was resolved that a report be made to the House in conformity with the above motion, and that the Law clerk be requested to prepare a Bill so amending chapter 61.







